

**THE PROBLEM OF
EDUCATIONAL AND SOCIAL ASSIMILATION:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF
THE CHINESE IN HAWAII
AND GREAT BRITAIN
(1782-1985)**

ALAN M. UYEHARA

**Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Education
in Consideration for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

1999

**UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION**

Culture, Communication & Societies Group



ABSTRACT

This study compares the educational and social assimilation of the Chinese in Britain and Hawaii using three of Milton Gordon's theory of assimilation variables: cultural, structural and marital assimilation. Emphasis is placed on the Chinese population arriving in Britain. Historical evidence and data are utilised to define the three assimilative variables.

The Chinese immigration into Hawaii is used as a model to compare and to examine the process of assimilation. The assimilation of the Chinese in Britain is divided into three period and topics. The first (1782-1900) records the emergence of the Chinese in Britain and the development of the Chinese community. The second (1901-1950) describes assimilation through intermarriage, education, occupational and spatial mobility, and responses of various segments of both communities. The third (1951-1985) enlarges on the previous periods and details the dramatic growth and challenges of the Chinese community.

A comparison and examination of the Chinese in Britain and Hawaii determine three things: (a) similarities of their assimilation; (b) other variables that affect the process of assimilation; and (c) an analysis of Gordon's theory as a valid instrument to examine assimilation.

Cultural assimilation is assessed through educational indicators. Access into the educational process suggests that immigrants adopt attitudes, values, customs, traditions and aspirations of the host society. Full participation in the educational system encourages movement into the diverse sectors of the working society. The result influences the development of primary relationships.

Structural assimilation is examined at the point of employment and settlement. The *Valuation List of Poplar* from 1915-1950 was surveyed to determine the number of Chinese owning property. Boarding house records of the London County Council and the *Thames Magistrate Records* were extremely helpful to determine the occupations of the Chinese living in Britain.

Marital assimilation is a powerful indicator. Marriages were determined by examining records from 1912-1982 at St. Catherine's House.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The completion of this paper is due to the assistance of many individuals and agencies. I would like to thank the following for their support.

Anglo-Chinese Educational Institute
China society
Chinese Chamber of Commerce
Chinese Embassy
The Cooper's Company and Coborn School, C. Churchett
The General Synod of The Church of England, Dr. B. L. Hough
Great Britain-China Centre
Greater London Records Office, Harriet Kenealy
Hong Kong Government Office, Mr. Victor Y. F. Chann
Inner London Education Authority, Hazel Pennell
Institute of Race Relations
Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants, Arman Alan Ali
London Borough of Tower Hamlets, Mr. Ian Orton
Racial Statistics Group
Society For Anglo-Chinese Understanding Ltd.
Statistical Bulletins
Tower Hamlets Central Library
United Kingdom Immigrants Advisory Service, K. C. Jessop

I am deeply indebted to Professor Brian Holmes for his direction and guidance in the preparation of the initial stages of this paper. His continued support and interest in the topic fuelled my energy to continue with this project.

I am grateful to Dr David Turner who read the rough draft and gave me invaluable insight and direction.

I am extremely thankful to Dr Martin McLean and Mr Crispin Jones who graciously offered to assist me through the final stages of my thesis.

I am thankful to my children who spent their youthful years in England, adjusting to a new culture and environment.

Finally, I am forever indebted to my wife, Shirleyanne, whose support and encouragement has inspired the completion of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT 2

ACKNOWLEDGMENT 3

LIST OF FIGURES 11

INTRODUCTION 13

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: INTRODUCTION 15

OVERVIEW 16

 Immigration: Boundaries and Definitions 17

MODELS OF INTEGRATION 18

 The Melting Pot 19

 Cultural Pluralism 20

REACTION 22

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 24

 Cultural Assimilation 24

 Cultural Assimilation Indicators 25

 Structural Assimilation 27

 Structural Assimilation Indicators 28

 Marital Assimilation: Definition and Indicators 30

METHODOLOGY 32

 Conclusion 34

CHAPTER II

THE CHINESE IN GREAT BRITAIN: 1782-1900

CULTURAL, STRUCTURAL, AND MARITAL ASSIMILATION

BACKGROUND 36

 Chinese Seamen’s Population 37

CULTURAL ASSIMILATION 38

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION 39

Employment as Seamen	40
Supplies for the Seamen	40
Settlement	42
Response of the Shipping Companies	44
British Government Response to Chinese Labour	46
British Newspapers	47
Local Government's Concern	48
Response of a Citizen	48
THE CHINESE RESPONSE: ESTABLISHMENT OF CHINATOWN	49
MARITAL ASSIMILATION	51

CHAPTER III

CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: 1900-1950

INTRODUCTION	53
EDUCATION IN LONDON	53
Dingle Land and Gill Street: London County Council Schools	54
Grammar Schools	57
Scholarships	58
The Case of Miss Robinson	59
THE CHINESE RESPONSE: MAINTENANCE OF CULTURAL TRADITION	65
Chinese Mutual Societies and Secret Orders	65
Gambling	66
Opium	67
Mother-tongue Education	68

CHAPTER IV

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: 1900-1950

INTRODUCTION	70
SETTLEMENT	70
The London Chinese Community	70
The Liverpool Chinese Community	71

The Birkenhead Chinese Community	73
The Acquisition and Leasing of Property	74
STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: EMPLOYMENT	76
Employment as Seamen	77
Employment in the Munitions and Aerodrome Factories	81
Employment in Boarding Houses	82
Employment as Launderers	85
Employment in the Restaurant Industry	87
Employment in the British Merchant Service	88

CHAPTER V

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: 1900-1950

THE RESPONSE OF THE BRITISH AND CHINESE

THE RESPONSE OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT	91
Aliens Act	91
Regulating Alien Identification	92
Lodging House Acts	93
The House of Commons	94
The Home Office	95
The Air Ministry	97
The Board of Trade	99
The City Council	102
The Private Shipping Companies	103
The British Seamen's and Firemen's Union	104
THE CHINESE RESPONSE	107
The Chinese Seamen's Union	108

CHAPTER VI

MARITAL ASSIMILATION: 1900-1950

INTRODUCTION	110
THE BRITISH VIEWPOINT	110

British Women	111
Marriages	113
THE CHINESE VIEWPOINT	114
INTERMARRIAGE RESEARCH	115
Intermarriages Before 1912	116
Intermarriages: 1913-1950	117
The Survey of Intermarriages in Poplar, Stepney and Limehouse	117
Surveys of Liverpool Intermarriages	118
SECOND GENERATION IN LIMEHOUSE	119
Marriages of the Second Generation	120

CHAPTER VII

CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: 1951-1985

BACKGROUND	122
Language of the Immigrant Children	122
Chinese Children Population	123
THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM	124
Challenges of the Second Generation: English Language	125
Discrimination	126
THE PROBLEMS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION	127
Isolation of Chinese Women and the Elderly	128
Under-Utilisation of the Social System	128
Self-reliance	130
CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: THE BRITISH RESPONSE	130
English Acquisition: The Local Educational Authority	131
Support of Mother-tongue Education	131
CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: THE CHINESE RESPONSE	133
Culture and Tradition	133
Concerns and Maintenance of Culture	135
Chinese View and Reaction Towards Education	136
Sending Children to China	138
Chinese Support of Mother-tongue Education	139

Mother-tongue Education	140
Kung Ho Association	141

CHAPTER VIII
STRUCTURAL AND MARITAL ASSIMILATION OF THE
CHINESE COMMUNITY: 1951-1985

BACKGROUND	144
THE CHINESE POPULATION	145
The Problem of Population Statistics	146
STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: EMPLOYMENT IN THE FOOD INDUSTRY	147
Unemployment	149
STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: SETTLEMENT	150
Problems in Council Housing	153
STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: THE BRITISH RESPONSE	154
Immigration Laws and Regulations: Implications	155
MARITAL ASSIMILATION	162

CHAPTER IX
THE EDUCATION OF CHINESE PUPILS
1951-1985

BACKGROUND	164
The Problem of Adequate Information	165
The Chinese Pupil	165
CULTURAL ASSIMILATION	166
Ethical Values: The Impact of the British Educational System	167
Cultural Preservation	168
Chinese Parents: Maintaining Tradition	169
Intrinsic Indicators: Historical Language	170
Extrinsic Indicators: Dress, Manners, Patterns of Emotional Expressions, and English	171
STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION	173

Primary Relationships	173
Employment	174
Educational Mobility: Educational Achievement	176
Educational Mobility: Further and Higher Education	177
Conclusion	178

CHAPTER X

THE CHINESE IN HAWAII

CULTURAL, STRUCTURAL AND MARITAL ASSIMILATION

BACKGROUND	180
THE PROBLEM	182
CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: RELIGION	184
CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: EDUCATION	184
CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: MOTHER-TONGUE EDUCATION	187
STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: PLANTATION EMPLOYMENT	188
STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: EMPLOYMENT IN RURAL OCCUPATIONS	189
STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY	190
STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: ESTABLISHMENT OF CHINATOWN	192
STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: MOVING FROM CHINATOWN	193
STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: HE RESPONSE OF THE HAWAIIAN GOVERNMENT	193
MARITAL ASSIMILATION	195
CONCLUSION	196

CHAPTER XI

ASSESSMENT AND COMPARISON

ASSESSMENT AND COMPARISON	199
Assessment and Comparison of the Problem	199
BRITAIN AND HAWAII: COMPARISON OF CULTURAL ASSIMILATION . .	200
Background Comparison	201
Comparison of English Language Acquisition	202

Comparison of Education Factors	204
RESISTANCE TOWARDS CULTURAL ASSIMILATION	206
Comparison of Mother Tongue Education	206
Comparison of Sending Children to China	207
Conclusion	208
BRITAIN AND HAWAII: STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION	209
Comparison of Structural Assimilation Indicators	209
Comparison of Settlement	210
Comparison of Employment	212
Resistance to Structural Assimilation	214
Conclusion	214
MARITAL ASSIMILATION	215
Comparison of Marital Assimilation	215
Conclusion	216
ASSESSMENT OF THE ASSIMILATION MODEL	216
Assessment of Cultural Assimilation	216
Assessment of Structural Assimilation	217
Assessment of Marital Assimilation	218
Conclusion	218
RECOMMENDATIONS	219
Cultural Assimilation	219
Structural Assimilation	220
Marital Assimilation	220
FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS	221
ENDNOTES	223
BIBLIOGRAPHY	277

**PAGE
MISSING
IN
ORIGINAL**

20.	Inner London Educational Authority: Main Language Groups (1981)	122
21.	Survey of Kung Ho Association: Enrolment (1982-1984)	141
22.	Kung Ho Association: Birthplace of Children (1982-1984)	142
23.	Kung Ho Association: Age Distribution (1984)	142
24.	Kung Ho Association: By Gender (1984)	143
25.	Comparison of Population Statistics: Merseyside 1980	146
26.	Great Britain Population Breakdown by County of Birth (1981)	147
27.	Household Size: Great Britain	151
28.	Passengers Seeking Leave to Enter the United Kingdom Who had British Dependent Territories Passports Issued in Hong Kong	160
29.	Survey: Number of Chinese Marriages in Britain 1951-1980	162
30.	Stages of Competence in English of Chinese-Speaking Pupils in ILEA 1981, 1983, 1985 (Percentages	172
31.	Population by Ethnic Groups in Hawaii: 1860, 1866 and 1872	181
32.	Population of Chinese in Hawaii: 1853-1930	182
33.	Arrival of Chinese in Hawaii: 1852-1899	183
34.	Years of School Completed by Persons 25 Years and Over: By Race in 1970	186
35.	Chinese Men Engaged in Rural Occupations: 1884-1930	189
36.	Percentage Distribution of Chinese Men Employed in Hawaii By Occupational Class: 1890-1970	190
37.	Major Occupational Groups of the Chinese in Hawaii: 1970	191

INTRODUCTION

Due to personal circumstances, this thesis has taken several years to complete. In 1983, I was accepted into the Institute of Education. My supervisor was Professor Brian Holmes. He helped me to understand the problem of assimilation as it related to education. I come from Hawaii, a multi-cultural society. My experiences were enriched by living among a diverse group of people. During the 1970s and 1980s, a vast number of immigrants came to live in the United States. They came from several countries as a result of war and conflict. They immigrated, and were given a new life.

The topic of how education influenced immigrants interested me, and how immigration affected the lives of adults and children. These immigrants would have an impact the educational and social system of a country. I was interested particularly in the Chinese living in Britain. Embarking on the research, I started to collect data. I found a wealth of primary resources on this community. I wanted to tell their story.

After two or three years, the format and direction of the paper were finalised with his approval. Professor Holmes eventually retired, and I returned to Hawaii for personal reasons. Complications with the technical aspects of my thesis made it extremely difficult to complete. I still received encouragement from Professor Holmes. Unfortunately, a year later, he passed away leaving me without any guidance and without anyone to help me. I continued, however, to write my thesis. In 1995, I decided to contact the Institute to see whether I could resume my program. Dr. Martin McLean and Crispin Jones graciously offered their help. It has taken me another three years to bring this thesis to its conclusion.

The assimilation process of the Chinese into Great Britain can be divided into eight periods. Using cultural and structural indicators, all chapters will emphasize the influence of education on. The first period of the study, before 1900, records the emergence of the Chinese in Britain and the gradual development of the Chinese community. Chronicled was their employment, shifting from the East India Company to private shipping companies. It also shows the growth and establishment of "Chinatown." The second period (1900-1950) describes the gradual development of the hostile relationship with the Seamen's and Firemen's Union before and after WWI. It also describes the Chinese working to support the British in other occupations during the War and the development of the community. This was accomplished through

intermarriages, the birth of children and their education, and the use of Chinese branching out into other types of employment due to their deficient educational attainment. Finally, the third period (1951-1985) details the dramatic growth of the Chinese community after the war. A new wave of Chinese immigration arrived in Britain. They came with similar desires of employment and settled, but had limited educational training. The cycle of assimilation began again on a wider scale. A comparative study of all periods in the final chapter will be made to determine the extent to which the Chinese in Britain had been assimilated, concluding that education undoubtedly influences cultural and structural assimilation, and impacts an immigrant's integration into a new society. The comparison will be made between Hawaii and the Chinese in Britain within each period under investigation.

The structure of the thesis, emphasising educational influences on the assimilative process of the Chinese in Britain and Hawaii, is divided into eleven chapters as follows: Chapter II: 1782-1900--Cultural, Structural, and Marital Assimilation; Chapter III: Cultural Assimilation--1900-1950; Chapter IV: Structural Assimilation--1900-1950; Chapter V: Reaction Towards Structural Assimilation--1900-1950; Chapter VI: Marital Assimilation--1900-1950; Chapter VII: Cultural Assimilation--1951-1985; Chapter VIII: Structural and Marital Assimilation--1951-1985; Chapter IX: The Education of Chinese Pupils, Chapter X, The Chinese in Hawaii, from their early arrival in the mid-1800's through the 1970's, and Chapter XI: Assessment and Comparison.

The first chapter will lay a foundation of the study, describing the assimilative variables, and how education is used to weave through these concepts. In the following chapters (two-ten), these variables will be used to describe the Chinese based on cultural, structural and marital assimilation in various time-periods, underscoring the impact and influence of education on these indicators. The focus will be made on employment, residence, cultural values and tradition, and how education shapes each variable. Finally, a comparison will be made based on the impact and influence of education's role on the assimilative process of the Chinese in Britain and Hawaii.

When I left in 1985, my thesis had been limited by Professor Holmes to a specific time-frame and focal point. I believe that the topic and the primary resources utilised in this thesis are of interest. I hope that this thesis will be a contribution, and provide an understanding of education in the lives of the Chinese community in Britain.

CHAPTER I

THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

Britain has always been a multicultural society.¹ Since 1950, the government has been challenged by the influx of racial minorities, to provide education, adequate housing, and other entitlements. Educational programmes such as craft and cultural subjects, language studies, physical education, an intensive programme of mother-tongue, English as a second language, and basic literacy and numeracy works were established to integrate these groups.

How does education determine and impact the process of integration or assimilation in a multicultural society? This thesis will examine this process of assimilation by comparing the Chinese population in Hawaii and Britain. Historical resources and evidence will be used to explain how cultural, structural, and marital assimilation have shaped the Chinese community in both countries, and how these factors have impacted education.

The Chinese-Americans have successfully integrated into the Hawaiian society. As indentured labourers, they were the first ethnic group recruited to work on the plantations. After many years, along with other minorities, they developed a multicultural society without a dominant racial or cultural majority.² As a whole, since 1960, based on such socioeconomic indicators as education and occupation, native and foreign-born Chinese Americans have achieved a level of education equal to or higher than that of whites.³ Likewise, a higher proportion of Chinese Americans have been employed in white collar occupations than have whites.⁴ These two factors have contributed to higher family income,⁵ and suggest that they have successfully integrated into the American society.

The Chinese have lived in Britain for more than a hundred years. They came as seamen on British vessels. Some settled and established homes, married British women and raised families. Their children were British. During the two major world wars, they worked as seamen, or in the aerodrome and munitions factories and in the merchant maritime services. After World War II, the British government recruited them and other ethnic minorities to help in reconstructing the country. The Chinese

population became larger during the 1960s and the 1970s. With the return of Hong Kong to China, another group of Chinese has appeared on the doorsteps of Britain. Immigration in both countries has affected each group. The phenomenon of immigration will be discussed in the following sections.

OVERVIEW

Educational institutions are challenged by new groups of children impacting the system. Marcus Hansen, writing on the effects of immigration, states that immigration creates problems that are normally unresolved, particularly with the first generation.⁶ First generation immigrants usually maintain their native language and practice their cultural traditions. Often, these practices are viewed as an unwillingness to adapt and adjust to the norms of the core society. Their limited interaction with the indigenous population typically causes distrust and uncertainties.⁷

Immigrants arrive with optimism, hoping to achieve financial and social success. The host society expects them to speak their language, to develop primary relationships, and to become economically stable. Often, they remain enclosed in their ethnic community, relying on their ethnic group for financial security through their business ventures. They are unprepared educationally to compete with the core society. Usually, their businesses do not compete with their hosts, but if they do, they frequently encounter problems--sometimes violent.

Each citizen reacts. Their response, whether negative or positive, becomes the problem to be addressed. Some people within the core society are unsure of these immigrants. Unable to speak their language or understand their culture, they expect the immigrant to speak the native language, and to adopt their traditions. The government responds by passing laws and other regulatory acts to control the immigrant population. Factions exhibit their prejudices, often making the integration of the immigrant more difficult.

Within the immigrant family, problems often arise between first and second generations. Children are sent to school where they adopt and infuse the ideologies of the core society taught by the educational system. They resist and resent parents "old-fashion" and traditional ideas. Parents do not understand their children's newly adopted attitudes, and expect their children to be proud of their ethnic heritage. The combination of these attitudes fuels emotional conflicts that add to the difficulties of

assimilation.

A few groups have been assimilated. In the United States,⁸ the Chinese have assimilated through their educational achievements. Nevertheless, despite unforeseen obstacles, immigrants continue to arrive with differing aims and aspirations. Some view their circumstance as long-term, while others are willing to stay for a brief time, and then return to their home country.

Immigration: Boundaries and Definitions

Some immigrants are sojourners.⁹ They view their move as temporary, always awaiting an opportunity to return home. Sojourners are not part of the core community, nor do they intend to integrate. Some even exist on the periphery of their own ethnic group. Confined by long, tedious and exhaustive hours at work, they find it almost impossible to establish and to develop primary relationships within their own ethnic group. They remit money to their family still living in their native country, frugally saving for their return to their homeland. Many sojourners, however, never return. Some eventually do not return home because of economic, physical or domestic changes that occur in their lives.

For most immigrants the decision to leave "home" is an economic necessity. Each believes that a fresh beginning will provide educational and economic opportunities for their children and families. This idealistic, yet myopic view of a new life overshadows unforeseen problems of conflict and difficulties that they will encounter. Unable to return to their home country, they attempt to establish a stable economic foundation for themselves and their families, and to cope with unforeseen difficulties.

The response toward minority groups varies according to the perceptions of the core society. Armed with apprehension, distrust and prejudice, they resist embracing these immigrants. Nation states, convinced that their national economic assets are limited, believe that the addition of more people undermines their livelihood and will deplete their economic stability. Consequently, financial and economic resources are unavailable to assimilate the immigrant, causing misconceptions and intolerance towards the immigrant. Prejudices continue to persist even when the immigrants do not pose a threat at all.

Ultimately, the challenge for the immigrant to adjust to the new society is

formidable. When they come as temporary settlers, they look for opportunities to return to their home country, or even to remain indefinitely in a host country. Their inadequate educational preparation, compounded by their failure to speak the core language, makes their transition more difficult.

To reduce conflict, immigrants need to integrate quickly into the core society. Migrant workers, asylum seekers or illegal residents, who are in constant transition, are not expected to integrate. Over the years, researchers and policy makers tend to disagree on three levels of integration or models: assimilation, melting pot and cultural pluralism.¹⁰

MODELS OF INTEGRATION

Within sociology, assimilation is used in racial and ethnic relations. It is a process by which persons of diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds interact together within a larger community.¹¹ Ultimately, immigrants accepted the cultural norms and lifestyle of a core society that eventually lead to their loss of identity as an ethnic group.¹²

The term assimilation is considered contentious and regarded illegitimate in European political debate.¹³ Assimilation, historically, deliberately destroyed a minority's cultural tradition. A few modern nations have followed this model. John Crowley (1996) stated, "the construction of modern France proceeded in this fashion, and British responses in the 1960s [and] followed a similar pattern."¹⁴ Assimilation, in a cultural sense, defined the minority's loss of language, traditional dress, dietary customs, and intermarriage is the theoretical and empirical core of assimilation.¹⁵

Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, who were noted sociologists, first formulated the assimilation model in *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (1921). Louise Wirth and Franklin Frazier, who were his students, believed that assimilation was natural and inevitable.¹⁶ Later, researchers like Lieberman (1961), M. Gordon (1964), Barth and Noel (1972) developed more complex and sophisticated models of assimilation.¹⁷

Park gave a description of four types of interaction--competition, conflict, accommodation and assimilation.¹⁸ In a broad sense, assimilation is a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons or groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups. Their experience and history are

shared and incorporated into the common cultural life of the community.¹⁹

Park describes the immigrant as the *marginal man* whom fate condemns to live between two societies. Whatever the motive for leaving their country, the immigrant like the marginal man is forever delicately balancing between two diametrically opposed and extrinsic cultures.²⁰ Park postulates that out of the conflict the individual emerges "with the wider horizon, the keener intelligence, the more detached and rational viewpoint."²¹

The complexity of the *marginal man* concept provides other perspectives on assimilation. Edward Cary Hayes (1925) challenged the four classifications of Park and Burgess.²² To replace their taxonomy, he proposed the establishment of thirteen social relations. He suggested the utilisation of assimilation be defined as the result that follows social suggestion, sympathetic radiation and imitation.²³ He proposed that assimilation be regarded not as a process but a product or outcome of a social relationship. In a response to Hayes, Floyd Nelson House (1926) confirmed that "assimilation . . . can be taken either as an activity or as the result of an activity."²⁴ Eventually, other models of assimilation like the melting pot, were proposed by other researchers.

The Melting Pot

The assimilation model slowly developed and extended beyond the concepts and theories as previously held by Park and others. The melting pot model, which became a new perspective during the 1940s, was illustrated by the "melting down and reshaping" of Europeans as Americans.²⁵ This concept attempted to eliminate apparent physical differences so all people would look alike. Still, compulsory education and other social factors continued despite prejudice, and afforded opportunities of social and financial success for the immigrant based on educational achievement and attainment.

The model allows cultural and ethnical homogeneity by interaction among all existing groups, as active participants to form a new nation.²⁶ R. Vecoli (1995) states that "this ideology, including one in which the Anglo-American is the cook stirring and determining the ingredients . . . "²⁷ He further states, that although "the Melting Pot ideology comes under sharp attack in the 1960s as a coercive policy . . . immigration of recent years and the related anxiety over national unity has brought it back into favour

in certain academic and political circles."²⁸

The history of the melting pot theory can be traced to J. Hector St. John Crèvecoeur's 1782 publication, *Letters From an American Farmer*. The work describes the synthesis of the American people resulting from the melting of immigrants in a crucible of the Western frontier.²⁹ Crèvecoeur was asked to answer the question "What is America?" He replied that "these people are a mixture of English, Scottish, Irish, French, Dutch, Germans and Swedes . . . from this promiscuous breed, that race now called American has arisen."³⁰ In this sense, assimilation's meaning originates from the American immigration movement. Henry Pratt Fairchild (1913) equates assimilation with Americanisation.³¹

Israel Zangwill's (1909) image of the "melting pot"³² defines the immigrant's attitude towards assimilation as partial, selective or involuntary. The melting pot included the creation of a new nation through biological interbreeding.³³ European groups in the US seemed to be "melted" but the Black, the largest minority group, never assimilated. They continued to suffer prejudices and discrimination, and for many, this situation was proof of the failure of the assimilation and melting pot ideals.³⁴

The melting-pot supporters simply focussed biological interbreeding as the foundation of creating a new people and eliminating discrimination. Melting-Pot theorists were not interested in social or educational issues, suggesting that the "melting" of races would naturally eliminate discrimination and social problems. Of course, the melting-pot theory was challenged, and other theories emerged which focussed on the preservation of culture and tradition.

Cultural Pluralism

Starting in the 1950s new concepts emerged to challenge the melting pot concept.³⁵ Cultural pluralism became an alternative to the melting pot. Dissimilar to assimilation and the melting pot, cultural pluralism promoted heterogeneity as a permanent phenomenon in society.³⁶ It was founded on the concept that different groups of society influence each other, and together a national space was created in which participants are citizens with equal rights. It promoted the creation of a national space where participants are citizens with equal rights and maintain their ethnic diversity.

Vecoli (1995) states "the fortunes of the pluralistic model have fluctuated with

the national mood. During the 1930s, when cultural democracy was in vogue, pluralistic ideas were popular. Again during the period of the "new ethnicity" of the 1960s and the 1990s, cultural pluralism attracted a considerable following. In recent years, heightened fears that American society was fragmenting caused many to reject pluralism for a return to the melting pot."³⁷

R. A. Schermerhorn (1978) says that many definitions of pluralism exist, but four basic meanings can be clearly distinguished: ideological designation, political designation, cultural designation, and structural designation.³⁸ Ideological designation was a belief of a minority group that asserts their desire to preserve their way of life though it differs from the dominant society. Political designation refers to groups that pressure the making and applying of political decisions through the political process or media.³⁹ Cultural designation is maintaining the ethnic group's identity through language, religion, kinship forms, nationality, tribal affiliation, and traditional norms.⁴⁰ Finally, structural designation defines an ethnic group as a multi-cultural or multiethnic society with plural structural units.⁴¹

David Ley, Ceri Peach and Colin Clarke (1984) believed that pluralism in a more permissive class-based framework underscores assimilation.⁴² Gordon believed that structural pluralism promotes primary relations in the minority group and secondary relations outside it.⁴³

N. Carmon states that these three models "take a macro viewpoint of the receiving society."⁴⁴ Each immigrant has different motivations. Without considering their wishes would be a mistake. The immigrants determine their integration or non-integration. "Within the category of permanent international immigration . . . there is more than one pattern of integration; different groups can make their choices between assimilation and the preservation of specific parts of their original culture . . . "⁴⁵

Vecoli believes that the three models have lost their interpretative and characteristic value.⁴⁶ He suggests that there is a need for a new model to define the identity as people encompassing multiculturalism and ethnicity in a context of a multiethnic world.⁴⁷

In terms of education, multicultural education emerged in an attempt to transcend racial and cultural boundaries. It was viewed as a potential solution to inequality, underscoring the need for structural change and access in education. It recognized that all cultures have resources and value. Multicultural education serves to

open opportunities for learning, by stimulating an engagement in different forms of inquiry.

REACTION

Nation states determine how minorities will be integrated into their society. In Europe, some believe that imposed assimilation is the only answer agreeable with democracy.⁴⁸ A widespread belief in France suggests that minority cultures and identities threaten their national culture and identity. While minorities should have equal rights as citizens, they should be discouraged from maintaining their own cultures.⁴⁹

Several critics have questioned the validity of any assimilation model. Charles Hirschman (1983) points out that Lyman (1968) described Park's theory as an "untestable thesis that does not specify when changes in the race relations cycle will occur."⁵⁰ Some believe assimilation has lost its credibility. Assimilation is a powerful force affecting ethnic and racial elements in the U. S., but the great failure of internalisation the Afro-American counterattacked the ideology of assimilation.⁵¹ Richard Alba (1995) states that assimilation has become a "dirty secret."⁵² Nathan Glazer, professor of education and sociology at Harvard University, states that the term "assimilation" has been discredited, and replaced by cultural pluralism or multiculturalism.⁵³ Proponents of full assimilation are minuscule, and they can scarcely be distinguished in public discussion.⁵⁴ John Rex (1996) believes a society promoting assimilation may establish a breeding ground for racism.⁵⁵

Stephen Cornell (1997) suggests two more phenomena that encouraged the collapse of assimilation: the post-independence experience of "new-nations" and the experience of the more industrial parts of the world.⁵⁶ When colonialism ended, new nation states were created, and the "grip of colonial power loosened, ethnic, kinship, regional, and religious ties, both old and new, threatened to demolish the fragile social order life in the wake of colonialism."⁵⁷ The second development in industrialised regions of the world, particularly in the US, where "ethnic and racial claims, counterclaims, and confrontations" challenged and frustrated assimilationist expectations.⁵⁸ These events promoted the self-identity of new nations and their people, often raising contradictions between theory and reality. Despite its weakness, Hirschman believes that the assimilation perspective has organised the field and

stimulated empirical studies, and several major studies has strengthened it as a general paradigm, although it is plagued by controversy.⁵⁹

Many nation states have adopted new ideologies in race relations. The British have adopted multiculturalism as a new goal for race relations.⁶⁰ John Rex (1996) explains that the problems posed to society is not equality or its promotion, but a multicultural society where people are not equal but differently treated.⁶¹ This perception assumes a diversity of social services inclines to meet the needs of each ethnic group. Ideally, some believe that all minority cultures should enjoy equal respect but due to the ambiguity of multiculturalism, far from being equal, minorities should receive something different and inferior, which is true in the sphere of education.⁶²

Maurice Craft writing on education for diversity states multicultural education may be viewed as a social process, and suggests that education provides social continuity and engenders social change.⁶³ He contends that it is "a process linked to powerful structural and ideological variables in the wider society, education may vary according to the importance placed upon individual development compared with the perceived needs of society."⁶⁴ A plural society is more diverse and requires conformity yet has a resistance to conformity.⁶⁵

Still, a multicultural society must be distinguished from other notions of a pluralistic society. The ideal of multiculturalism, as Rex believes, is described as " . . . a society which is unitary in the public domain but which encourages diversity in what are thought of as private or communal matters."⁶⁶ He cautions that multiculturalism should not be seen as a society that allows "diversity and differential rights for groups in the public domain and also encourage or insist upon diversity of cultural practise by different group."⁶⁷ Finally, the private domain socialises individuals for participation in the public sphere while the public domain is shaped by the morality of the family and religious institutions.⁶⁸

In conclusion, the previous sections have discussed the various concepts regarding assimilation. The use of the assimilation model, in this thesis, is intended to examine how education impacts these indicators in light of the Chinese population. These variables are useful since they clearly define and highlight areas where the Chinese have or have not assimilated into the British society. It is especially true when these indicators are linked to education.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework of this thesis is based on three variables--cultural, structural and marital assimilation. In each instance, these variables will be linked to education. To define these variables further, indicators for each will be described, clarifying what factors will be used to analyse, assess and compare assimilation of the Chinese in Hawaii and Britain.

Cultural Assimilation

Several concepts of researchers and scholars have been reviewed to determine cultural indicators for this study. Cultural assimilation may occur even when none of the other types of assimilation occurs, and it may continue indefinitely.⁶⁹ Pierre L. Van Den Berghe (1970) states that "cultural assimilation is a proof, not of liberalism, but rather of ethnocentrism and cultural (though not racial) on the parts of the dominant group."⁷⁰

Bruce A. Chadwick and Joseph H. Stauss (1975) in their study of the assimilation of the American Indians in Seattle, Washington used seven of Gordon's variables.⁷¹ To measure cultural assimilation they used the concept of "separatism," the desirability of the Indians to separate themselves spatially, politically, and economically from the general society. To assess cultural assimilation, they measured educational attainment, employment, status of occupation, income, religious preference, ability to speak a native language and attendance at powwows.⁷² Cultural assimilation is measured through "generation" exposure over time to the American milieu.

Cultural assimilation is the process of change or abandonment of cultural traditions, beliefs, etc. It is also the acceptance of a new set of values. Two cultural patterns characteristically of an ethnic group may be affected in the acculturation process. First is intrinsic--"religious beliefs and practices, ethical values, musical tastes, folk recreational patterns, literature, historical language, and sense of a common past (cultural heritage)."⁷³ The other is extrinsic--"dress, manners, patterns of emotional expression and minor oddities in pronouncing and inflecting English."⁷⁴ If assimilation has been complete in all intrinsic and extrinsic cultural traits, then value conflicts are less likely to arise within the society.⁷⁵

Harry H. Bass (1979) argues that Gordon's analysis was the interchangeability of conceptions between social and sociological perspectives.⁷⁶ These concepts are

discussed in the extensive literature on assimilation. The basic intent of the immigrant should focus on cultural assimilation.⁷⁷ The second generation, however, "should be realistically viewed as a generation irreversibly on its way to virtually complete acculturation but not necessarily structural assimilation."⁷⁸ D. Massey and B. Mullan agree that cultural assimilation was least problematic and "most groups complete it within two generations."⁷⁹

The success of cultural assimilation, however, does not guarantee entry of the minority group into the primary groups or institutions of the core society. Nor does it eliminate prejudices and discrimination or, typically, lead to large-scale intermarriage with the core society. Two factors that may retard the success of cultural assimilation are: (a) geographical (spatial) segregation, or (b) usually marked discrimination in keeping vast numbers of the minority group from educational or occupational opportunities.

In the United States cultural assimilation has taken place for many groups, especially when descendants of immigrants have adopted "American Ways."⁸⁰ Each immigrant generation normally limits its acceptance of the values and customs of the core society. Their children, the second and succeeding generations, when exposed to the educational system of the country, will usually adapt to the new culture and accept the norms and social structure of the new society. The process, however, can be retarded if vast numbers of the minority groups are restricted, deprived or even denied educational and occupational opportunities. They are destined to remain separated and relegated to remain in a sub-level or entry-level occupation. Acceptance as a minority into primary groups and institutions will depend on the core society and the educational environment they offer.

Cultural Assimilation Indicators

Data on some aspects of cultural assimilation was not readily available. Educational indicators will be used in its place. Education is a fundamental component that prepares immigrants to compete with the indigenous population. Hirschman states that education is the key indicator or achievement in the socioeconomic hierarchy and influences social and economic mobility and an important step toward full participation in society.⁸¹ Education provides the avenue by which immigrants and their children are able to move beyond the entry level jobs. A. Schlesinger states that the schools and

colleges train citizens for the future, and the public schools have been the greatest instruments of assimilation and means of forming the core society's identity.⁸² He continues, "What students are taught in schools affect the way they will thereafter see and treat other Americans, the way they will thereafter conceive the purposes of the republic."⁸³

The use of educational indicators is warranted since educational attainment has a direct linkage to cultural and structural assimilation. Successful participation in the educational process presupposes that the immigrant group has adopted the attitudes, values, customs, traditions and aspirations of the host society. In turn, full participation in the educational system encourages movement into the diverse sectors of the working society. Educational attainment and training are likely to reinforce the adoption of values, customs and traditions of the host nation. As a result, primary relationships may be encouraged and developed with members of the host country.

To determine whether the Chinese in Britain and Hawaii were culturally assimilated, the following indicators will be used: (1) English language acquisition; (2) entrance into the educational system; and (3) acceptance of Britain's or Hawaii's traditions and values, i.e., religion, cultural activities, etc. Antithetically, indicators opposing cultural assimilation are: (1) development of mother-tongue education⁸⁴; (2) maintenance of traditional beliefs; (3) alternative education to the core society's educational system; and (4) maintenance of cultural traditions. Underscoring these indicators is the response or lack of response to cultural assimilation of the core society.

Investigating the problem, no theoretical analyses or information of Britain's Chinese community before 1950 concerning assimilation was found. Finding primary materials was necessary to arrange the information into the three classifications under investigation. For Hawaii, a wealth of information was available concerning the Chinese. This information was arranged to show the validity of each indicator. Research of school records was conducted to gather the names of British Chinese children. This information was used to estimate the population of the Chinese community, to determine whether they continued their education after leaving school for additional training, and their marriage partners. At St. Catherine's House, the depository for births, deaths and marriages for England and Wales, research was conducted into the marriage partners of these children and names of other Chinese living in Britain.

Kung Ho School, a mother-tongue school, at Leicester Square provided another insight of Chinese children after 1980. The research was done to discover the origin of the children and whether they had British first names. The names were important to learn whether they identified themselves as British. This information would help decide, to a degree, whether they were on the way to be culturally assimilated. Furthermore, the acquisition of mother-tongue education may have an impact on structural assimilation as well.

Structural Assimilation

The next area of research is structural assimilation--the development of primary relationships. Such relationships influence an individual's entrance into the social cliques, organisations and institutional activities. This means that the immigrant is involved in the civic life of the receiving community on a primary group level.⁸⁵

Structural assimilation is the "keystone of the arch of assimilation" rather than cultural assimilation, since all other types of assimilation will naturally follow.⁸⁶ Complete structural assimilation causes the "disappearance of the ethnic group as a separate entity and the evaporation of its distinctive values."⁸⁷ Structural assimilation will not occur if ethnic minorities develop their own network of assistance within their group. Such support might include youth programmes, adult clubs or community associations focussed primarily on the needs of their group.⁸⁸

Education has an immense impact on structural assimilation. Movement to different occupations and spatial mobility are dependent on educational attainment. Primary relationships developed with the core society are also influenced by education. Education's impact cannot be overlooked or overstated in this process.

Indicators of structural assimilation indicators are provided through research done by several people. Robert Schoen and Lawrence E. Cohen (1981) proposed two important variables to differentiate assimilation: occupational status and generation of exogamy.⁸⁹ Hirschman addresses occupational attainment and incomes, and states that the Chinese have made significant strides toward socioeconomic equality with the core society.⁹⁰ Chadwick and Stauss (1975) measured structural assimilation by the percentage of Indians living in an urban area, the number of organisational memberships, the extent of regular social interaction with the core community, home ownership, current employment and marital status.⁹¹

Schoen and Cohen (1981) proposed occupational status as a variable to show the different dimensions of assimilation.⁹² Through the occupational dimension, structural assimilation was shown as a successful integration into American economic life.

Richard D. Alba (1982) believed in socioeconomic integration rather than integration in primary relationships.⁹³ He also questioned Schoen and Cohen's use of occupational status as an indicator of structural assimilation.⁹⁴ Schoen and Cohen responded that their research was methodologically sound, meaningful and theoretically reliable.⁹⁵ The usage of structural assimilation was not novel. Their theoretical analysis centred on the belief that as cultural assimilation proceeds rapidly and with structural assimilation inactive, "substantial levels of exogamy are a response to cultural more than to socioeconomic factors . . . the cultural variable, generation, should be more closely related to out-group marriage . . . than the socioeconomic variable occupation."⁹⁶

Research conducted by Massey and Mullan mentions that physical integration into the core society was necessary for structural assimilation to occur. They believe that spatial assimilation is an intermediary step between cultural and structural assimilation. Spatial assimilation is a process where a group achieves residential proximity with members of the host society.⁹⁷ The success of cultural assimilation depends on whether a minority group was spatially isolated and segregated, whether voluntary or not.⁹⁸ Massey and Mullan (1984) describe spatial assimilation as the movement of ethnic minorities from established racial or ethnic neighbourhoods into a larger urban environment inhabited primarily by the members of the core society.⁹⁹ Ethnic minorities change the location of their residence due to improvements in education, income and occupational status. The role of educational attainment and training encourages emigrants to enter into the larger society, rather than isolating them. The following section will discuss the indicators that trace the areas where the Chinese have been structurally assimilated.

Structural Assimilation Indicators

Gordon believes that structural assimilation of the first generation adult immigrants is an undesirable goal because they are entrenched in their own culture, and unable to make a total transition into the core society.¹⁰⁰ The enforcement of structural assimilation is both futile and tension-producing especially within the community of

intellectuals.¹⁰¹ This study will examine the development of broad ties, at the point of employment and settlement. These will be used as indicators of structural assimilation. While this may not be the most appropriate measure for all immigrant groups, adopting this rationale can identify the deeply held beliefs of both the Chinese who came to Britain and the members of the British public who received them.

In theory the indicators of structural assimilation are as follows: (1) employment or occupation; (2) admittance into the clubs, cliques, etc.; and (3) spatial mobility,¹⁰² the process by which a group attains residential proximity to members of the host society and move from established racial or ethnic neighbourhoods into a larger urban environment inhabited primarily by the white population. On the contrary, indicators negating structural assimilation are: (1) remaining in ethnic occupations; (2) enclosure with ethnic organisations, social interaction with members of their own ethnic group; and (3) lack of home ownership or spatial mobility. Also, included in these categories are the responses of the British and other ethnic communities. These indicators include legislative mandates, discrimination, biases of the British society, ethnic seclusion or isolation in any form.

Initial immigration into Britain and Hawaii occurred within a single occupational category. The Chinese in Britain were seamen, then caterers after 1945. In Hawaii they were indentured labourers. The diversity or lack of diversity of employment, therefore, will prove or disprove a measure of structural assimilation. Their settlement or place of residence can denote the degree to which they were received into the general civic life of the core community.

To assess structural assimilation, as it pertained to spatial mobility, the *Valuation Lists* of Poplar from 1915-1950 were surveyed to document the number of Chinese owning property and their residence. These records also showed whether the property was used as a business or a place of employment. Boarding house records of the London County Council were examined to estimate how many Chinese were boarding house keepers. In addition, the Thames Magistrate Records (1880-1901) were researched to determine when the Chinese had come to Britain and why they were brought before the courts. Educational records will also be used to evaluate the level of education of the children who accompanied their parent, or who were born in Britain.

Materials on the early Chinese seamen and their involvement with the East India Company were researched at the India House library. Information was limited.

Valuable information was gathered, however, showing the interest the Company had in the Chinese and other foreign seamen.

Marital Assimilation: Definition and Indicators

The final indicator used in this study is marital assimilation. Although not specifically an influence on education, Hirschman states, "more than any other indicator, intermarriage represents the final outcome of assimilation."¹⁰³ A definite connection of time order is evident between structural assimilation and marital assimilation.¹⁰⁴ When the minority group enters the cliques, clubs and institutions of the host society, many intermarriages will occur.¹⁰⁵ Marriage statistics, when available, are direct indicators of marital assimilation. The statistics also reveal an interesting fact, that intermarriage may occur even if there was limited or no structural assimilation. This suggests that a consideration of other factors are necessary to investigate the practice of marital assimilation in Hawaii and Britain.

Intermarriage is a powerful indication of assimilation where intermarriages occur at high rates between groups. Other researcher's findings recognize and substantiate the import of these indicators on relationships. Chadwick and Stauss (1975) assessed marital assimilation by studying the marriages of whites to Indians and the Indian ancestry of the marriage partner.¹⁰⁶

Douglas T. Gurak and Joseph P. Fitzpatrick (1982) suggest that the social proximity of many people from different ethnic backgrounds must be developed through formal and informal settings such as residential, occupational or social.¹⁰⁷ Gurak and Fitzpatrick believe that social distance (the orientation of members of one group towards members of other groups) was essential for high rates of intermarriages to occur.¹⁰⁸ Both clarify "assimilation" and may elicit negative responses because of the disappearance of a group's culture into the core society, marriage outside one's group does not imply movement to the core group. Ethnically close groups (Dominican and a Puerto Rican) may not imply a movement. Therefore, distinguishing marriages as out-group marriages between Hispanics and marriages between Hispanics and non-Hispanics was important.¹⁰⁹ Finally, out-group marriages (among two dissimilar cultural groups) should not be viewed as encouraging the disappearance of the ethnic group because social change could occur in each group behaviour and in the social distance separating groups.¹¹⁰

Deanna L. Pagninni and S. Philip Morgan (1990) claim that intermarriage was a measurement of assimilation and an agent producing it.¹¹¹ Ethnicity does influence the choice of marriage partners, but this preference was waning.¹¹² Yet, when third and fourth generations also intermarry, tracing their ethnic heritage will be impossible. Extreme levels of intermarriage show social integration, revealing intimate relationships with the core society. Reducing the imparting of ethnic culture and traditions to children are also indicators of assimilation.

Spacial segregation influences the separation of an ethnic group from the core society. When immigrant groups are spatially segregated, endogamous marriages increase.¹¹³ Intermarriages of third, fourth or later generations had a profound influence on endogamy.

If people are structurally assimilated,¹¹⁴ intermarrying without first establishing primary relationships was impractical for individuals. It was realistic that children from different ethnic backgrounds will marry each other if they belong to the same play groups, cliques, fraternities and sororities; and if their parents belong to the same country clubs and are socially active with each other.¹¹⁵ As a result, the minority group will lose its ethnic identity within the host society. Identification assimilation will occur and prejudice and discrimination will no longer be a problem. Eventually, identification, attitude receptional, behaviour reception and civic assimilation will follow in rapid succession.

When the minority group enters the cliques, clubs, educational systems and institutions of the host society, many intermarriages will occur due to the primary relationships that are developed.¹¹⁶ It should be noted that other indicators of marital assimilation are the responses of the core society and the cultural values of the immigrant.

Intermarriage studies have a variety of methodological problems.¹¹⁷ These include the census and survey data among currently married population; cross-sectional data underestimate the extent of intermarriages; and the comparison of intermarriages between populations and across time.¹¹⁸ For this study, marital assimilation for the Chinese living in Britain was determined through marriage records at St. Catherine's House. Several weeks were spent systematically extracting from more than one thousand texts of marriage records, between 1912-1984, Chinese marriages. This method provided a sampling of the number of Chinese marriages and the name of their

marriage partner.

Marriages before 1912 were more difficult to assess because the names of both partners were necessary to determine the spouse. However, a brief perusal of the marriage records was made for the years between 1895-1912. No Chinese names could be found. British women who associated with Chinese men were also researched (for those after 1912) to find whether they had married a Chinese. No searches were made for marriages of British women identified in various materials who married a Chinese.

METHODOLOGY

This thesis will use historical sources underscored by educational evidence to study the Chinese in Hawaii and Great Britain. Little research has addressed the Chinese using historical and educational data during the period under investigation. Besides, this data can be used to review past events. The thesis's primary objective is to investigate the Chinese in Britain using retrospective educational and historical material to analyse their assimilation.

The section of the Chinese in Hawaii will use secondary materials since a plethora of research has already been conducted concerning them. Consequently, this approach will give a different perspective of the assimilative process of the Chinese in Hawaii. The primary emphasis of this study is centred on the Chinese in Britain, while the Hawaii section will be used as a model to analysis and compare the two countries. This comparison and examination will focus on two things: (a) similarities or dissimilarities between Chinese assimilation; and (b) other variables that affected the process of assimilation.

Educational evidence will be used to determine the extent of cultural assimilation, and how it has affected structural assimilation. It will also determine the influence of education on assimilation, particularly the impact it has on the first, second, and succeeding generation of Chinese.

Data for this study came from a variety of sources. It includes a cross section of national and local government documents, trades unions and their publications, newspapers and other important historical sources. The initial research focussed on three areas: cultural, structural, and marital assimilation. A survey of literature found a dearth of information regarding the Chinese in Britain. Moreover, useful information was found in contemporary newspapers, Home Office files and London County Council

records in relation to schooling, as well as the usual academic literature on education and on the Chinese population in Britain.

Newspapers were a main source for this information. Many articles regarding the Chinese from the early 1800's to the present time were found in *The Times*. The *Seamen*, the official publication for the Seamen's and Firemen's Union was an invaluable source showing the annoyance of the British seamen towards the Chinese. Research showed a decrease after 1921, of press coverage of the union towards the Chinese, probably suggesting that the issue over the Chinese was in decline. Other local newspapers were also consulted--*East End News*, *Liverpool Courier*, etc.

The Home Office files were heavily researched. They contained a rich resource of data and facts regarding the Chinese in London, Bicester, Liverpool and other port cities. The Marine Transport records provided information regarding the employment of the Chinese onboard ships, illegal smuggling, repatriation schemes, works in the munitions factories, etc.

Eventually, to assess cultural assimilation, a determination was made through the London County Council records. Several school admission records were consulted for the years of 1920-1939. These schools were in Limehouse: Ricardo, Northey Street that changed its name to Cyril Jackson in 1925, Farrence, Dingle Lane, Davenant, Dolphin Lane, Gill Street, Coopers and Coborn, George Green, etc. Unfortunately, the records of Dingle Lane, which was the primary school the children attended, were not available. It was believed that the records and the school did not survive the bombardment by the Germans. Only the Inspector's Reports for two years are available. The research showed that Dingle Lane, Cyril Jackson, Davenant, and Gill Street were the schools attended by the Chinese children. In addition, George Green and the Coborn schools were visited to consult their admission registry to discover who and how many Chinese children continued their education.

As for the current Chinese community post 1950, research has been primarily centred on newspaper articles, government reports, and information from secondary sources. The difficulty here was that most of the primary materials other than the ones already mentioned are not accessible for research because of the privacy act. However, in the future more research in these areas needs to be conducted, to bridge and complete the picture of the Chinese community, its social position and its educational aspirations.

Existing research shed some light on various aspects of Chinese living in Liverpool and London. Researchers like Kwee Choo Ng (1968), Ann Garvey and Brian Jackson (1975), Norman Fitchett (1976), James L. Watson (1977), Irene Loh Lynn (1982), Maurice Broady (1952), C. Holmes (1978), D. Caradog Jones (1934), Douglas Jones (1979), Patricia Langton (1979) provided invaluable information. The Home Affairs Committee (1985) represented most of the work regarding the current Chinese living in Britain. Their investigation encompassed all facts of the Chinese community, including education, employment, living conditions, etc.

To answer the question of assimilation, primary materials were uncovered, then analysed and synthesised to provide the information needed for the study. National and local governments also kept information regarding the Chinese. However, no definitive study regarding the Chinese before 1980 existed. Even existing statistical information, particularly Census Reports, was often questioned by the researcher to determine the validity of the information. An example was any Census before 1900. Under the category "place of birth," statistics did not specify whether the individual had been born in China (children of missionaries or other nationals born in China could be included in this category). Nor did the records specify whether they were people of Chinese origin. Probably, the Chinese would not have participated in the Census because many were transient and could not speak English.

The scale of the problem enlarges because records for distinct ethnic groups were not available. Correspondence with the several agencies was made, asking for assistance in the research. Some furnished information and shed more light on the Chinese than others.¹¹⁹ Detailed information regarding the occupation (structural assimilation), education, the use of the English language, mother-tongue education (cultural assimilation), and intermarriages were not entirely available for all periods defined in this study. As a result, original research was conducted to gather this information.

Conclusion

The role of education is finely intertwined with two major variables in this study—cultural and structural assimilation. In essence, through compulsory education, the second and succeeding generations learned by the values, traditions, and morals of the host society. Using cultural variables and indicators will show how education

shaped the lives.

Structural assimilation is also impacted by education. When they are more qualified and educationally prepared, the Chinese can achieve occupational mobility. They will not be limited to the catering industry able to move into the professional and technical areas of the core society. With more money, they will be able to move from ethnically enclosed communities to other communities dominated by the core society.

Education can be a catalyst for change. Through these institutions people meets and develop lasting relationships that could mature into marriage. Choices to mixed or endogamous marriages depend on the preference on the individual. The study will show that marital assimilation on a "large-scale" is not influenced by cultural nor structural assimilation. The following chapters will research the assimilation of the Chinese in Britain. Chapter II will examine the Chinese in Britain and to establish the research framework. It will investigate the influence of cultural, structural and marital assimilation on the Chinese in Britain.

CHAPTER II

THE CHINESE IN GREAT BRITAIN: 1782-1900

CULTURAL, STRUCTURAL AND MARITAL ASSIMILATION

The problems associated with assimilation have been identified through the inquiry of the Chinese immigration into Hawaii. The assimilation model was used to measure the success of their cultural, structural and marital assimilation. Hawaii's Chinese showed a gradual move from immigrant contract labourers to their eventual cultural and structural assimilation into the Hawaiian society. Their experience typifies the complexities and variables of assimilation, which deviates with each new set of circumstances.

This Chapter will begin the investigation of the Chinese in Britain. It will examine the cultural, structural and marital assimilation of the early Chinese between 1782-1900. The areas of settlement, employment and marriage will be analysed. In addition, the reactions of the British towards the Chinese, and the Chinese response to the British community will also be evaluated.

BACKGROUND

It is unclear when the first Chinese arrived in Britain. One source reports that the Chinese lived in Britain as early as 1782.¹ With the growth of the East India Company, Chinese presence became more apparent. Hired as seamen, their population soon dispersed throughout the British seaport cities, as British ships arrived with valuable commodities from the Far East.

The growing trade in Asia encouraged the hiring of cheap foreign labourers. Seamen from various countries, typically from economically depressed areas, were enlisted to work for the Company. Many were hard workers, and compared with their British counterpart, were cheaper to employ. Since the Chinese economy was devastated by famine and other natural disasters, they were willing to accept any employment to support their families.

When the Company lost its shipping monopoly at Canton in 1834, independent traders and shipping companies demanded that the British government loosen its regulations regarding Chinese trade. The government conceded, but would not

abandon its grasp on the opium market.² Later, a disagreement between the British and the Chinese government ignited a crisis and confrontation over the issue of opium. The resulting conflict ended with the defeat of China in the Opium War (1839-1842).

In 1841, Hong Kong was annexed to the British. Through the Nanking Treaty of 1842, the British also received Shanghai, Canton, Ningpo, Foochow and Amoy.³ These agreements guaranteed the opening of major Chinese ports for trade, and made it possible for the British government and private shipping companies to employ the Chinese on their vessels. Consequently, shipping companies like Alfred and Philip Holt in Liverpool developed strong trading ties in Asia.

Chinese Seamen’s Population

As trade increased in Asia, more foreign seamen, including the Chinese, arrived in London, Liverpool and other port cities. After arriving in Britain on inbound ships, these seamen were forced to wait for a ship returning to their homeland.

A Return of the Number of Foreign Seamen Employed in British Registered Vessels in the Years 1851-1867 ⁴ Table 1			
Year	No. Foreign Seamen Employed	Year	No. Foreign Seamen Employed
1851	5793	1860	14280
1852	5700	1861	Not Completed
1853	7321	1862	16096
1854	13200	1863	18933
1855	12927	1864	21923
1856	13321	1865	20280
1857	14375	1866	Not Made
1858	12334	1867	21817
1859	12296		

General Register and Record Office of Seamen. *House of Common Papers*, 1859. (Session 2), xxvii, 561.

Shipping records reveal more Lascars than Chinese were employed on outbound ships.⁵ In March 1813 and December 1814 on the *Java* and the *Barrosa*, only two

crew members were recorded to be Chinese.⁶ Between 1 May 1813 and 30 April 1814, due to severe weather conditions, one hundred and five Chinese and two hundred and thirty-seven Lascars died.⁷ This loss was the highest mortality rate between the Lascars and Chinese to that date.

In 1851, 5,793 foreign seamen were employed on British registered vessels. The seamen's population rose to 12,334 by 1858. Nine years later, in 1867, 21,817 were employed by the British.⁸ By 1898, the East India Company had increased their ships from fifteen to forty-nine. Though the seamen's number increased, the population of Chinese remained low in comparison to other foreign seamen.

CULTURAL ASSIMILATION

The Chinese seamen were not a homogeneous group. They came from various parts of China and spoke different dialects. An article in the *Notes and Queries*⁹ described a group of Chinese seamen living in the Eastend of London. Many came from a district in Canton known as *Sin Nan*. Some were the *Punti*, or genuine *Cantonese*; the *Hakka*, involved in the Taiping Rebellion; and the *Hoklo*, immigrants from the neighbouring province of Folkien.¹⁰ Chinese seamen were predominantly the Cantonese from the Pearl River Delta, while others originated from the coastal provinces, such as Shandong, Ningbo and Fukian.¹¹

The Chinese working on British vessels were firemen, seamen, stewards, and cooks. Traditionally their place of birth delineated their occupation on the sailing vessel. Cantonese from Panyu were firemen, boatswains and seamen. Stewards came from the treaty port of Ningpo. Cooks came from the island of Hainan.¹² Their occupation also determined their primary relationships. Usually relationships were developed with seamen who had come from the same district and spoke the same dialect.

Many seamen, while awaiting for a return voyage, would spend time preparing ethnic food, indulging in opium smoking, and gambling. The Chinese were criticised for their opium smoking. Opium was flagrantly used by the habitual user and by Englishmen addicted or curious about this drug. An Englishman stated that after entering an opium shop, he would lay on a couch, while his host would prepare a pipe for him.¹³ He continued by stating:

Certainly this will not be my last trial; the experience

was sufficiently interesting to make me curious to carry it a point further, and see what the dreams of the actual opium sleep are like . . . As for the so-called "dens," they seemed to me simply poorly fitted social clubs, and certainly as free from anything sensibly objectionable as, to say the least of it, public-houses of the same class.¹⁴

Their confinement of primary relationships to their own group isolated them from the British population. Interactions between various nationalities of seamen, and even among different factions of the same ethnic group, proved so volatile that, occasionally, bitter fighting erupted, causing injuries and death. The *National Register* reported one dangerous riot in Shadwell between the Chinese and Lascars, which resulted in the death of three men and the wounding of about seventeen.¹⁵

Altercations also occurred within the Chinese factions. One violently erupted in a place that belonged to the East India Company called King David's Fort. A riot between two sects--the Chenies, and the Chin-Choo involved five hundred men living in the barracks. Disagreements usually resulted with one sect fighting the other with knives and other weapons. In this incident, the Chenies overpowered the Chin-Choo due to their sheer numbers.¹⁶

In brief, cultural assimilation did not occur for the Chinese during this period. Since their stay in Britain was temporary--awaiting an outbound ship--accepting the cultural values of the British was unnecessary. Relationships were developed primarily with seamen who were assigned the same onboard ship, and spoke the same Chinese dialect. Their circumstances precluded their need to speak English. They did not accept Christianity nor adopt the British culture. In addition, no evidence verified that Chinese children were attending the local British schools. Ultimately, they did not acquire the intrinsic and the extrinsic patterns of the British society but continued to wear their Chinese dress and hairstyles and participated in Chinese activities, such as gambling and opium smoking. These activities also isolated them from the British, as they spent time with members of their own ethnic group.

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION

This section will examine the Chinese employment, settlement or spatial mobility. The development of primary relationships, through the responses of the

British and Chinese seamen, will also be examined. Occupational status or employment determined whether the Chinese could successfully move from one occupation or position to another. Settlement or spatial mobility ascertains the movement of the Chinese living in established racial or ethnic neighbourhoods into areas inhabited primarily by the British. Lastly, primary relationships will be evidenced by the acceptance or rejection of the Chinese into the social cliques or organisations of the British society.

Employment as Seamen

The motive of the shipping companies, operated by the government or private enterprise, and the Chinese who sought employment on the shipping vessels, was purely financial. Their intent was to reduce their overhead and expenditures by hiring inexpensive labourers.

The Chinese seaman had limited skills. One situation that alarmed the East India Company was their lack of gainful activity while awaiting an outbound ship to return them to Asia. Employment and providing for the welfare of the seamen were the responsibility of the Company while they were onshore. Many worked on the Rope Grounds. When they learned that the seamen disliked this type of labour, the Company stopped the activity. The reasons they stopped were as follows: (a) their lack of interest in work outside their profession; (b) their physical abilities were inferior to the European; and (c) their employment would take jobs away from English and Irish Labourers.¹⁷

Supplies for the Seamen

While the foreign seamen were employed, shipping companies provided their supplies. For the East India Company, this responsibility started on 9 November 1795.¹⁸ They assumed the responsibility for the seamen's physical welfare including clothing allowances, medical care, food, lodging, and their return passage to either India or China. This commitment amounted to thousands of pounds annually.

The Company's food allowance was as follows. Asians received one pound of rice per day, sugar, tea, pepper and onions, one pound of mutton, greens every day, two red herrings and unlimited amounts of potato.¹⁹ The Chinese also received daily provisions: one pound of rice, one white herring, three-quarters of a pound of beef,

greens, onions, pepper, salt, sugar and tea.²⁰ Each seaman received his daily ration at eight in the morning.

Each seaman received a jacket, two pairs of trousers of coarse cloth, two shirts, two pairs of stockings, two caps, two pairs of mittens and a pair of shoes. A lucrative business soon developed. Seamen exchanged their clothing allowance for drink and other services.

The men cooked their own food in assigned areas, detached from their sleeping quarters. If they had rations of fish, they saved most of it for their next voyage. Against shipping regulations, many Chinese sold their rations of sugar and tobacco, while the other seamen sold their tea, sugar and tobacco.²¹ Occasionally, a few seamen sold their clothing. One seaman, a Lascar, was flogged for selling his clothing and part of his food rations that he had received the previous day.²²

The cost of maintaining foreign seamen was exorbitant. From 1803-1813, Company records show the total expenses for the maintenance of ten thousand fifty Lascars and Chinese. They paid three hundred and seventy thousand four hundred and eighty-six pounds ten shillings nine pence for medicine, clothing, and an additional amount for their return passage to India or China.²³

Expenses Incurred by the East India Company for the Maintenance and Return of Lascars and Chinese Brought to England from 1803-1813 ²⁴						
Table 2						
Season	No. of Men	Maintenance Received in England	Medicine	Clothing	Passage to India or China	Total
1803-13	10050	117957	11793	37043	200692	370486

Marine Miscellaneous Series of the India Office Records. Marine Department. *Papers on Lascars 1793-1818*, IOR: L/MAR/C/902, 2:120.

In brief, the Company, as part of their obligation to all foreign seamen, including the Chinese, provided employment, housing and looked after their physical welfare at an exorbitant expense. The seamen were well kept, and had the provisions needed for their employment. Evidence of a major shift in employment was not found concerning work outside the shipping industry. This suggests that most Chinese were confined to this vocation.

Settlement

Preceding the opening of the East India docks, the Lascars, Chinese and other foreign seamen were kept onboard the ship after their arrival in Britain. Beginning in 1797, arriving Lascars and Chinese were lodged at Kingsland Road, Shoreditch in the house of Mrs. Susannah Smetza.²⁵ After 1799, she and Mr. Cotes of Hackney Road, housed the Lascars and Chinese in equal numbers in their homes.²⁶ By September 1802, the East India Company had also contracted with Mr. John Anthony of Shadwell to provide additional housing.

After the death of Mr. Cotes, magistrates received complaints from the local residents about the nuisance of seamen living so close to the City of Shoreditch. Subsequently, Mr. Anthony housed all the seamen. The widow of Mr. Cotes received a compensation of two hundred pounds²⁷ for the loss of income she suffered due to the change of housing accommodations. Upon the death of Mr. Anthony in July 1804, the Lascars and Chinese stayed with his widow until she remarried three months later. The seamen were later transferred to the care of Mr. Abraham Cole in Shadwell.²⁸

Tension gradually mounted between government critics and the East India Company over their housing policies. To defuse further friction, the Company moved the Lascars and Chinese seamen from private dwellings to separate barracks. Repairs and maintenance of the barracks, besides safeguarding its sanitary conditions, became the responsibility of the person contracted to board and lodge the men. The Company paid the main expenses, expending one shilling and six pence for board and lodging for each man per day, with a supplementary tuppence daily for tobacco.²⁹

Hilton Docker was appointed medical attendant of the East India Company in 1807. In a letter dated 10 March 1810 to Mr. John Morice, a member of the East India Company, Docker explained his concern about the housing of the Lascars and Chinese. In September 1809 the foreign seamen suffered significant disease and death. He felt that it was caused, in part, by not being acclimatised to the English weather. He suggested that the seamen were idle, inactive, depraved and that they should be employed for the first five weeks of their arrival. Such activity would, he suggested, helped acclimatise them for their new surrounding.³⁰ In another letter addressed to the Company on 28 February 1814, he protested against the *serang[es]*³¹ who had ordered the flogging of a Lascar who had sold his clothes. He confirmed that punishment seldom happened despite having sixteen hundred men onshore at once.³² On 3 February

1814, Docker further stated his belief that the squalid living quarters of the Lascars were due to their inherent filthy habits that they defy to remedy.³³ Docker believed the Chinese could not be blamed for this type of behaviour in their habits.³⁴

During the year, the barracks held 1,000 or 1,100 men, far exceeding housing conditions. As the seamen came into the barracks at Shadwell, they brought their hammocks, bedding and chests of clothing from the ship. Still, the men, customarily, slept on the floor without any bedding, except a blanket.

The barracks were described as well built with spacious rooms and wooden floors. Each room had a stove, and the floors were always dry.³⁵ Seamen were placed in several rooms, designed according to their religion, country, and arriving ship. The premises were frequently fumigated and lime-washed both before and during occupation to help prevent contagious diseases.³⁶ European servants cleaned the exterior of the building while the seamen cleaned the interior of the rooms.

Foreign seamen's housing was a concern to others. A group of philanthropic gentlemen worried about the health of the seamen. Their primary concern was death, which they felt could be attributed to the seamen's poor living conditions, the disciplinary measures and their lack of clothing. It was further stated that,

...the healthy are boarded and lodged in the same apartment with the sick, the dying and the dead; that there is no difference between the diet of the sick and the healthy; that whether ill or well, they are alike necessitated to lie on the bare and damp floors, without covering, and even during the winter season, when six, eight, and even ten, night after night, have been found dead . . . ³⁷

Housing issues were discussed by the Committee on the State of Police of the Metropolis. They met on 2 May 1817, and discussed the issue of housing licenses. One member of the committee, Mr. Rhode, felt that the housing licenses should not be rescinded in Shadwell because the population consisted of foreign sailors, Lascars, Chinese, Greeks and the women would never live with them. ³⁸

In the 1850's, in the Bluefields district (K Division), a large brothel established in the area catered to the foreign seamen from ships trading in the East.³⁹ The Chinese, also Lascars, lived in this district, sometimes intentionally deserting their ships, or simply missing their ships due to their misfortune or opium indulgence.⁴⁰

The Chinese seamen were not concerned about housing since the shipping

companies provided it for them. Usually they were housed with other seamen near the dock lands. This situation separated and isolated them from the mainstream of British life. They lived in cheap public housing, particularly in lower income areas.

During this period they did not move to the prominent geographical areas where the British lived. Primary relationships did not occur with the British. Even relationships within the Chinese community varied from group to group.

Response of the Shipping Companies

Shipping companies viewed the employment of foreign seamen from an economic standpoint. They were not seeing the long range implications of their actions, even with an increase in the permanent Chinese community. In contrast, as the number of Chinese seamen increased, the British government, British seamen, and general citizenry opposed, in various ways, the gradual influx of the Chinese into their country.

Docker sent a letter to the Company. He suggested that foreign seamen be employed onshore to prevent any illness that would be a savings to the Company.⁴¹ Nevertheless, he was quick to admit that if such a policy was accepted that several hundreds of the British would be deprived of employment.⁴²

Hence both policy and humanity will prevent the adoption of a means that while it tended to relieve a race of foreigners (who have no families in this country to partake of the benefits) from the only evil they are subject to, affects of climate, would expose several hundreds of our own native population with their numerous families . . . ⁴³

The Chinese seamen were convinced that the English and Irish labourers would prevent them from working. In fact, a Chinese seamen, who had been employed as a lumper⁴⁴ was so cruelly beaten by the Irish lumpers that he finally resigned from the work.⁴⁵

The government had problems monitoring the employment of foreign seamen, and enforcing their policies. New legislation, passed at the turn of the century, attempted to protect the British labour force from the insurgence of foreign seamen, particularly the Chinese. The Navigation Acts of the seventeenth century required at least 75 percent of the crew be British seamen. With the impressment

of British seamen into the Royal Navy for the Napoleonic wars, shipowners reluctantly enlisted Lascars and Chinese for homeward voyages.

On 1 April 1802, the Company decided that Lascars and Chinese would not be used as part of a ship's company. In addition, the seamen would not be allowed to remain as passengers even with the court's permission for outward-bound voyages.⁴⁶ This resolution, however, was short-lived.⁴⁷ Ship owners clearly ignored these restrictions. An inspection of the *Glatton* on 20 December 1803 showed that the ship's owners, knowingly, sent, on an outward voyage nine Chinese without official orders from the government.⁴⁸

Surveyors, on 18 April 1804, discovered eight Lascars on the *Cauffoulls*. The captain requested that the Lascars be permitted to remain as part of the ship's company. Although these are the only two recorded cases available, the shipping companies were, obviously, aware of the stringent regulations controlling the use of foreign seamen. Often, as a matter of expediency, they simply disregarded the government's regulations. On 13 April 1808, the East India Company Committee of Shipping passed a formal resolution to curtail and regulate the use of Lascars and Chinese.⁴⁹

In March 1812, the East India Company defined the responsibility of the private ship owners.⁵⁰ They insisted that Lascars and Chinese brought to Britain be maintained in England, and that their return fare to their native country be paid by the shipowners. Conditional licenses granted to ship owners, required them to assume the responsibility of maintaining and returning sailors to their native country. If the shipowners ignored the permit issued them, the Company could detain the seamen and charge the expenses to the owners. Although the shipowners took precautions to guard against this problem, seamen frequently deserted in London or other seaports. Authorities asked apprehended seamen the name of their ship they had arrived on in England. In cases where this information could not be obtained, due to language difficulties, the charge of maintaining and returning such men were assumed by the Company. The costs were five-hundred pounds annually.⁵¹

Due to the scarcity of British seamen, however, the Company was allowed to recruit Lascars, a situation that eventually affected the employment of the Chinese.⁵² The practice of employing foreign seamen continued under the direction

of the various private shipping and trading companies, after the passage of the 1813 Charter Act. Ultimately, this practise led to the growth of foreign communities in London, Liverpool, Cardiff and other sea ports.

By 1836, the influence of the East India Company had declined to the point that the policies, whether enforced or not, could not be executed. In January 1836, *The Times* printed a report describing the predicament of four Chinese seamen who were ordered on shore in Plymouth. After completing their voyage, the report stated that the government could not decide what to do with the seamen.⁵³

The accelerated rise of the Chinese population hastened the extreme anxieties of the British government, general populace, and particularly the British seamen's union. Some advocated that employment of the foreign seamen should be resolved through legislation or sanctions. Legislative Acts such as the Common Lodging Housing Act of 1851 and the Mercantile Shipping Act of 1894, focussed on decreasing the employment of foreign seamen.

British Government Response to Chinese Labour

Starting in 1882, the British government addressed the question of Chinese labour. The Democratic Federation, a concerned group, held a meeting to discuss the introduction of Chinese labour into England. The Federation felt that the characteristics of the Chinese, i.e., "clever, industrious, sober, and energetic and they could save on wages which Englishmen could hardly accept without starving"⁵⁴ would not only eject labourers in all areas, but also filter through the mercantile houses. Most agreed that the importation and immigration of the Chinese, who were only interested in accumulating more wealth, had to be stopped before the "subsistence among the masses of people [became] more and more scanty, precarious, and insecure."⁵⁵

Mr. J. Edgcumbe, the Secretary of the Fair Trade League, opposed the importation of Chinese labour and stated that "there was a remarkable absence of facts with regard to this apprehended immigration; but taking for granted that such an immigration was impending, they could not assume that if the Chinese once came into the country they would necessarily live an unsanitary life [and] . . . they would be subject to the same laws as every person in the country with regard to sanitation."

British Newspapers

Chinese labour problems were often reported in the newspapers. They ignited and encouraged the anti-Chinese sentiment of the residents, eventually inciting the Seamen's and Firemen's Union to campaign for the elimination of Chinese seamen. Occasionally physical violence was the mode used to eradicate the threat. In American newspapers, reports proved the fears of British labourers, who felt that the Chinese would replace them in various industries.

The Times occasionally reported on the activities of the seamen. An article in 1855 explained that the police had prosecuted an Irishman for keeping a disorderly lodging house. He had housed fifteen Lascars, nine Chinese, two prostitutes, a poor Irish widow, and two dead bodies.⁵⁶ In 1870, though the numbers of Chinese were few, the British labour force was concerned about the "cheap" Chinese workers. On 4 April 1873, *The Times* printed, "in the present discontent of our coal miners it may be not inopportune to state what is the amount received by their Chinese brethren."⁵⁷

In 1877, *The Times* printed an article concerning white men who demanded exorbitant wages and eventually went on strike. It stated that "the employer of labour may be glad that he is not absolutely dependent on them and that he has at hand a more docile race of beings."⁵⁸ The sentiment about cheap Chinese labour had an enormous impact on British labour, and provoked more antagonism towards the Chinese.

Two years later in 1879, an article republished in *The Times* from the *Annales de l'Extreme Orient* in 1879, reported that the question of Chinese labour would soon be evident in Europe as it was in America.⁵⁹ Within fifty years, due to cheap transportation on ships, the Chinese would be transported to all parts of the world causing discontent among the working class.⁶⁰ The report assured the populous that Chinese immigration would occur sooner than they could imagine.⁶¹

The British viewed the Chinese as "pure and simple minus quality."⁶² Annis Lennoys, a journalist, described the attitude of the British towards the Chinamen. Lennoys stated:

The capacity for stowing himself into the smallest conceivable space is a characteristic and evident fact. I doubt if even a census-taker could disinter the whole household if he tried. There is an aggravating

plausibility of speech and a humility of demeanor in a Chinaman utterly baffling to an average Western mind. A Chinaman never can be persuaded because he won't argue.⁶³

Lennoy further stated that the Chinese isolated themselves from the rest of the crew but seized every opportunity to make money.⁶⁴ Another newspaper article described Canton or Hong Kong Chinese seaman as wearing seamen's clothing whose hair was neatly plaited and covered by a large golf-cap.⁶⁵

Local Government's Concern

Even the local government became involved in resolving problems associated with the Chinese. In one incident, three Chinese seamen (A-Sze, A-Heung, and A-Kin) who had lived in England for six months, subsisted on fourteen pounds each acquired by selling Chinese toys. The Lord Mayor consulted the East India Company, Board of Trade, and the Lords of the Treasury for assistance to resolve the matter. The following passage summarizes their conclusions. On 14 November 1835, Mr. Shelly (probably a government official) stated the following:

...the Company allowed all Chinese while in England 1s. 6d. per day, besides a place to sleep in. On leaving England a suit of clothese, a 'hamkmock', and 1 lb. of tobacco were given them; these men consequently were entitled to 9 pound 15s, besides clothing . . . adding 2 pounds for 'clothese' and 12 pounds, passage money . . . amounted to 23 pounds 15s. each man, or the four men to 95 pounds.⁶⁶

The Treasury ultimately granted only 40 pounds to help the local government. A Mr. Reed agreed to take them to India for the 40 pounds but the Chinese refused the offer. Making their way to London, the three men, eventually, petitioned the Lord Mayor, on two separate occasions, to help them by paying their passage to China. Finally, after six months of waiting, they boarded the *Julian* for China.

Response of a Citizen

From time to time, confrontations occurred between the British and Chinese. In 1782, a reporter for the *Morning Chronicle* described one such incident regarding

a person endeavouring to irritate a Chinaman.⁶⁷ A group of spectators gathered and encouraged the man in his harassment. The aggressor grabbed the Chinese man by the hair, in spite of the protests of the "gentler" part of the group. Unaware of the Western method of fighting, the Chinaman received severe blows from his opponent. He escaped into a building, shortly, returning with a dozen Chinese armed with short bludgeons. Ultimately he overpowered his assailant.

In short, Chinese labour met with mixed reactions. Different segments of the British society challenged the hiring of foreign seamen, particularly the British seamen who felt their jobs were in jeopardy. Politicians were concerned primarily because it affected the seamen. Government actions clearly showed that they attempted to regulate the number of Chinese. Newspapers and the general citizenry did not embrace the Chinese. With such conflicts, the Chinese did not develop primary relationships and chose the security of isolation and enclosure in their own community.

THE CHINESE RESPONSE: ESTABLISHMENT OF CHINATOWN

Eventually, a few Chinese decided to stay permanently in Britain. They resided in the port cities such as Liverpool, London and Cardiff, because of their employment. Some seamen leased their own quarters than live in housing provided by the Company. These lodgings were regulated by the local government authorities. Nevertheless, they lived in areas inhabited by other Chinese. Gradually, they developed their own community.

Chinatown evolved as the Chinese community established their businesses, residences and activities in a centralised area. Within Chinatown, the Chinese maintained their culture: eating their ethnic foods, gambling, smoking opium, sharing lodging, and mingling with their own people. As more seamen came ashore, the community grew. Restaurants, boarding houses and other businesses developed to meet the needs of the growing Chinese community.

Charles Dickens frequented the Limehouse district.⁶⁸ It was in Chinatown that "he received his boyhood impressions of Limehouse church and the later haunts of Captain Cuttle and Mrs. MacStinger in *Dombey and Son*."⁶⁹

Eventually, the Ratcliff Highway--from Tower Hill to Shadwell--became the jump-off point for many Chinese seamen who, conveniently, made it their home.



The parish was divided into three parts: "the waterfront . . . ; the early Victorian part running from Ropemakers' Fields . . . ; and the cosmopolitan part comprising the Chinese eating-houses and sailors' clothes stores of West India Dock Road." ⁷⁰

The Hamlets which lay beyond Ratcliff had for centuries led a remote existence, linked to their neighbours only by miry paths or by the river. This was especially so of 'Poplar-and-Blackwall', as the smaller and more distant of the two is called in the Stepney vestry minutes; but Limehouse was also tiny and obscure, until within a comparatively short time of its achieving a church and parish of its own. Though a part of old Ratcliff hamlet was then taken and added to Limehouse--the parish boundary lay as far west as Butcher Row, and is followed by the modern borough of Poplar--yet the two villages, Ratcliff and Limehouse, were always distinctly divided. ⁷¹

In the 1860s, the West India Docks (1802) and the East India Docks (1806) developed into "Sailortown" where men from the clipper-ships frequented the ports. ⁷² In the 1860s through the 1870s, the Chinese community, mainly seamen, lived on one street--Limehouse Causeway--next to the West India Docks. One report said that of Orientals living in Limehouse, the Chinese were the most prominent group. ⁷³ Similarly, the Liverpool Chinese community settled around Pitt Street, Cleveland Square and Frederick Street. Japanese, Persians, Turks, Egyptians, Arabs, and Chinese seamen lived in the docklands as well. ⁷⁴ Towards the end of the 19th century, the number of Chinese, in London and Liverpool, was negligible. By the turn of the century, however, the Chinese community had grown substantially.

In brief, the Chinese were not structurally assimilated through employment or spatial mobility--moving from their ethnic community to the broader British society. They worked on the ships, where occupational mobility was nonexistent. They remained ethnically confined to their positions on the ship based on their geographical origin of birth. Moreover, movement to other occupations or positions became irrelevant because their stay was temporary. Since the Chinese had not intention of settling in Britain, the shipping companies did not attempt to assimilate them.

Formal relationships did not occur with the British seamen, and interaction

with the British was minimal. Their relationships remained detached from their host. They maintained their own culture, spoke their local dialect, ate their ethnic food, and depended on other Chinese for their primary relationships.

Finally, the responsibilities of the Company and private shipping companies were to provide housing and provisions for the foreign seamen. Most seamen were confined to barracks or home assigned to them. Later, some seamen left the barracks, preferring to live with other Chinese.

The development of Chinatown was a natural process that slowly evolved in the late 1800s. Chinatown accommodated the residences and businesses that catered to the Chinese population. It became a place for the Chinese to develop relationships, to gratify their social and physical needs, and a refuge from the British. A few British visited Chinatown to satisfy their curiosity, not to develop primary relationships. In short, the Chinese moved from sponsored housing towards an ethnically enclosed society where structural assimilation through spatial mobility was nonexistent.

MARTIAL ASSIMILATION

This section will focus on the relationships between the Chinese and British women. Statistical information on Chinese marriages, before 1900, was difficult to obtain because of the unavailability of specific Chinese or British records. To determine Chinese marriages, verifying the marriages through the names of both the bride and groom for marriages before 1912 was necessary. A random sampling was made, but no Chinese names were listed before 1900. However, if the marriages were not performed by parish ministers, then no record would have been kept. Through an interview, one woman, who is one-quarter Chinese, suggested another type of marriage. She stated that her English grandmother had established a liaison with a Chinese seaman in the 1890's.⁷⁵ This form of marriage was not recorded.

The vast majority of Chinese living in Britain during this period were men. Chinese men who wanted to marry had no choice but to marry British women since Chinese women were essentially unavailable. Occasionally, there were a few Chinese women in Britain. The *Times* reported about two Chinese women, Attoi Whoatty aged twenty-four and Powyuen Guattoa aged eighteen who were the first Chinese women to have visited England in 1826 except a Chinese lady who died in

London the previous year.⁷⁶ The women had bound feet (an indication of their social status). They were in delicate health, and were persons of considerable status. Chinese seamen were of a lower economic and social status. It would be unlikely that they came from the same province as the women or that their low social position would allow them to associate with women of prominence. Therefore, it seems improbable that they would have met and married.

Finally, research into the marriages registered at St. Catherine's House, during this period, did not show any Chinese marriages, either endogamous or interracial. The Chinese did not practice interracial marriage at this time. Large-scale intermarriages did not occur, suggesting that marital assimilation was not a factor for the Chinese

At the turn of the twentieth century, hostility toward the Chinese escalated as their numbers increased and when their stay in Britain became more permanent. During the next period (1900-1950), the expansion of the Chinese community will begin to unfold as they established their families and homes in Britain. Chapter III will assess the cultural assimilation of the Chinese community from 1900-1950.

CHAPTER III

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: 1900-1950

INTRODUCTION

Chapter II has examined the genesis of the early Chinese community in Britain. During these years the Chinese community did not assimilate. This chapter will examine cultural assimilation: the acquisition of the English language, the change of cultural and behavioural patterns of the Chinese, during the fifty years after the turn of the century. The study will also focus on the cultural assimilation indicators that affected the Chinese-born second generation.

Finally, this Chapter will underscore the importance of the educational process and how it enables cultural assimilation to occur. Central to this study will be records of the Infant and Secondary schools that are available. The population of the Chinese children in London was small. Nonetheless, the study will show their immersion in the educational system and the impact it had on cultural assimilation.

EDUCATION IN LONDON

Local school records were researched at the Greater London Records Office to locate Chinese children attending school in Limehouse before 1900. Records of schools surrounding the dock lands were also searched. No evidence was found to show that Chinese attended these schools. Sometimes records were unavailable, possibly due to their destruction during World War II. Another explanation is that few, if any, Chinese children attended school during this period. However, starting in 1910 in the East End of London, the offspring of Chinese men and English women began to enter the educational system.

The children living in London attended the local British school. Most of the children were born to Chinese and English parents. Without any special programmes or provisions, they were expected to compete with other students and comply with the school's standards. Through the educational curriculum, the children acquired both intrinsic and extrinsic values and the fundamentals of education. They dressed in Western clothing, spoke English as their primary language, and participated as British citizens in schools, without any reason to be considered different from their British

peers.

These second generation English-Chinese children faced challenges. Unlike their Chinese father, who had no formal education in Britain and possibly in China, they left the safety of ethnic neighbourhoods to study the fundamentals of reading, writing, and maths. Yet, they knew little of their father's language or customs. At home, their English mothers reinforced the fundamental aims of education learned at school and were raised British.

Dingle Lane and Gill Street: London County Council Schools

Many primary schools were established in Limehouse, Pennyfields and the Tower Hamlet area--Upper North Street, Ricardo Street, Northey Street, Dalglish and Farrence Street. Most English-Chinese children attended two primary schools in London: Dingle Lane and Gill Street. *The Admission Records* for the Dingle Lane School in the London County Council (LCC), listing the names of all students, were unavailable. These were presumably lost or destroyed during the War.

The London County Council school in Dingle Lane High Street, Poplar was officially opened in 1910.¹ Before its opening, two temporary schools had been established in the area--Dingle Lane Girls and Infants and Dolphin Lane Boys' School. With the construction of a permanent building, the educational authorities transferred the girls and infants to the new school. A few months later the Dolphin Lane Boys' School closed and moved to the new facility. Two hundred fifty boys were enrolled in the Boy's school, and two hundred thirty-five pupils could be accommodated in the six rooms.²

The *1911-1912 Annual Report of the London County Council* stated that the new school could hold seven hundred forty. Seven hundred four were dispersed in the following manner: boys--two hundred thirty-five, girls--two hundred twenty-four, and infants--one hundred forty-eight for a total of six hundred seven pupils.³ Mr. J. Gate was appointed the headmaster of Dingle Lane Boys' School, while Mrs. S. T. Wilson and Miss N. Blackburn were head mistresses of the Girls' school and the Infants' department respectively.⁴

According to various school *Registries*, approximately eighty-four children were

enroled.⁵ This number spanned a thirty six years from 1900-1936 in the Limehouse. Children from minority groups represented less than 1 percent of the total enrolment of the school. A breakdown, in the chart below, shows the number of known Chinese children (the majority being part-Chinese) by birth-dates.

Number of Chinese Children Enroled: 1900-1936 Table 3			
Year	Boys	Girls	Total
1900-1910	5	0	5
1912-1920	13	9	22
1921-1929	16	30	46
1930-1936	5	6	11
TOTAL	39	45	84

Alan M. Uyehara, Compilation of LCC School Records, 1986.

Dingle Lane's *Admission Records*, listing the names of all students were unavailable and presumably lost or destroyed during the War. The *Inspector's Report* for 1915, however, has survived.⁶ It described the children in the school as "clean, tidy and exceedingly well-mannered" and that the "tone of discipline throughout the school was very good."⁷ They came from migratory families. Only half were promoted from the infants' department, which may suggest that some parents had moved before or after the child's enrolment.⁸ From the school register, the number of removals shows the migratory nature of some families. Most of the children were born in England and had "strong indications of a foreign strain in their faces."⁹ Many came from mixed marriages, i.e., Chinese, Arabs, Negroes, Japanese, etc.¹⁰ The total pupil population came from poor homes. The *Report* described these children as "low in intelligence."¹¹

Dingle Lane had six classes, each holding forty children. Two classes were designated as Standard II consisted of I and II Standards, while the lower classes did Standard I work.¹² After working for a year in Standard I in the infant's department, the children took an additional two years to reach Standard III in the Senior department. Finally, from the eligible forty-four girls nominated for the Junior County Scholarship

Examination, the council nominated ten, while twenty-five remained in Standard III.¹³

In 1920 The *Daily Telegraph* reported that several boys and a few infants were Chinese.¹⁴ It described one child as one who spoke excellent English and had won a certificate in maths and started to learn Chinese.¹⁵ Gill Street School's *Infant's Admission Register* (1923-1947) records fifty-five part-Chinese children, thirty-three girls and twenty-two boys, attending school.¹⁶ The *Register* showed thirteen of the children moved away from the area. Twenty pupils transferred to either the boy's or girl's Junior School. Nine transferred to Cyril Jackson Junior School and one to Northey School. Four pupils left school at the age of fourteen. Two were in ill health, and little is known of the six remaining children.¹⁷ Medical records also show that thirty-five children had the measles and two pupils, who had English surnames, had Chinese guardians.

Gill Street's *Inspector's Report of 1931* explained that the fathers of the students were mostly dock labourers. The children were of "mixed-type" who, though coming from poor families, were clean. Parents appreciated the education and instruction their children received from school.¹⁸ Finally, the inspector reported that pupils' speech deficiency was due to their background. He recommended that "although the reading in the various classes reaches a very fair standard, more systematic and daily drill in speech training is necessary."¹⁹ The *1931 Report* added that a few Negro and Chinese children and several half-cast families attended the school, and the abilities of most the children were comparatively low.²⁰

The *Inspector's Report* for 1932 gave a brief account of the condition of the school.²¹ It explained that children of foreign extraction composed 12 percent of Dingle Lane School.²² Furthermore it described the children as coming from homes that were the "poorest" in Poplar where the housing conditions were just as bad.²³ Their fathers were casual labourers, and about 40 percent were unemployed. They worked as shopkeepers, cooks, seaman, tobacconist, shipping agent, boardinghouse keeper, grocer, and laundryman.²⁴

The *Gill Street Senior Girl's Register (1932-1939)* reported that seventeen girls continued to the Senior School. Thirteen had transferred from Dingle Lane School while two had left Gill Street and three had come from Cyril Jackson.²⁵ In the *Gill Street Senior Boy's Admission Register (1906-1932)* it shows a twenty-six-year span listing eighteen Chinese pupils. Only two were children of mixed marriages, and the

other two had emigrated with their parents from China. Sixteen of the boys had Christian first names, like all part-Chinese children born in England, while the remaining two came from Hong Kong and Pechili, China respectively.²⁶

Grammar Schools

Few Chinese or part-Chinese children attended Grammar schools during the 1920s. Children born of Chinese fathers and British women were probably not old enough to attend school, because only a few mixed-marriages were preformed before 1910. Another reason may be that most of the children could not pass the appropriate examination for admittance. A possible third reason is that parents could not afford the expense of educating their children even if they passed the examination, or were granted a place in a Grammar School.

Seven or eight grammar schools were established in the Tower Hamlets district. These were as follows: Central Foundation Girls School, Davenant Foundation School, Cooper's Company School, Coborn School, George Green's, Parmiter's School, Raine's Foundation School and Sir John Cass's Foundation and Read Coat.²⁷

If a pupil passed the entrance examination, he could enter any of the schools listed above. Few of these children enrolled in Grammar Schools in the Tower Hamlet area. The record of the George Green's School for boys and girls, 1884-1909 respectively, shows no Chinese pupils attending the school. Research into the George Green's *Admissions Records* for 1910-1950 showed three children with Chinese surnames attending the school. One was admitted in 1943; one in 1946; and the last one in 1948. Two of them continued their education and received a BA and B.Sc. degree respectively.²⁸

Nicholas Gibson founded Cooper's Company School in 1536. In 1701, Prisca Coborn founded Coborn's school. A few Chinese children were admitted--one as early as 1929.²⁹ This pupil left school in 1934 and became an office worker.³⁰ The Coborn school had two Chinese girls admitted--one in 1928 and the other in 1936. The former eventually moved to Thorpe Bay, Essex.³¹

Although many Grammar Schools were private institutions and most funding came from private sources, eventually the London County Council agreed partially to fund these schools. In fact, these schools provided many free and half-free scholarships. Typically the amount extended to 40 percent or more. Other students

paid modest fees. Financial awards given to the part-Chinese children by the grammar schools excluded them from paying any tuition. Sometimes, uniform and food allowances were also given, suggesting the difficult financial situation of the parents. The Education Act of 1944 ultimately stopped the provision of funds for pupils attending the Grammar Schools.

Scholarships

A resolution was passed by the London County Council in 1905 regarding the Junior County Scholarships. It stated that a student would conditionally receive free tuition at an approved secondary school for three years. This was subject to renewal after that time for two additional years, provided they maintain a high standard in conduct and attainment.³² Each pupil received a grant of six pounds a year for the first three years and fifteen pounds for the succeeding two years. Based on the parents' income, the grant did not exceed one hundred and sixty pounds a year. In the fourth and fifth years of the scholarship, the pupil received a maintenance grant of ten pounds.³³ The grants were insufficient to meet the total expense of schooling. As a result, parents still had to spend money on uniforms, transportation, meals, etc.

The Junior County Scholarship's list of awards confirmed that in 1915, no girls from Dingle Lane had passed the examination. Seven hundred seventy boys and seven hundred seventy-seven girls passed the examination that year. From this number, only twelve boys and five girls in the Limehouse district passed, while none were of Chinese or part-Chinese extraction.³⁴ In fact, no Chinese or part-Chinese children passed until the 1930s when a small group of three to five pupils received first class passes.³⁵ Even if the children passed the examination, the problem of finances may have been a deterrent to accept the scholarship. Families had to subsidise, partially or fully, their child's education. Grants were, however, available to help needy children.

In 1921, the London County Council met to discuss the migration of scholarship holders. The Council stressed that parents had the right to send their children to a school outside the area in which they resided.³⁶ The parents were required to pay a fee sufficient to cover the average cost of education, about forty-two pounds for maintained schools. In aided schools, however, the charge was forty-two pounds, less the Board of Education's substantive grant (seven pounds for children older than eleven). The grant would continue as long "as this continues to be paid independently of the deficiency

grant and less a proportionate part of the endowment."³⁷

Only a handful passed the Junior County Scholarship Examination that provided financial assistance to attend a grammar school in the area. Eighteen pupils passed the Junior County Scholarship Examination between 1923-1947. Two continued their education at Cooper's Company School and George Green's Senior School. One transferred to Central School. Another moved to a Grammar School known as the Central Foundation. Six were exempted, leaving school at the mandatory age of fourteen. The final seven moved from the area. The latter went to Amsterdam, Liverpool or Cardiff, and no one knows what happened to the remaining two pupils.³⁸ Of the seven who moved, four had originally come from Liverpool then returned, suggesting that their father had moved to London to seek employment. Nine had previously been at Gill Street Infants and were promoted to the Junior School. Two had previously been at private schools in Burdette Road before their enrolment into the Senior Boy's school. With the reorganisation of the Gill Street School on 5 April 1932, the *Register* (1932-38) shows only four boys enrolled in the Junior School.³⁹

The Case of Miss Robinson

The following account shows the attitude of one sector towards the Chinese. This account also illustrates prejudice, relationships between the Chinese and British women, and the prevailing attitude of one British educator. In February 1911, the Headmistress of the Gill Street, Limehouse London County Council School (LCC), Miss Robinson made several charges against the Chinese living in that quarter of the City, to the Education Office. Robinson accused the Chinese of being a detriment to her pupils and other children living within the community.⁴⁰ She stated her concern about several promising girls who had left school after becoming involved with the Chinese. The increase in the numbers of Chinese in Limehouse, she said, "seems to be a point needing attention."⁴¹ Though a small minority of Chinese men married English women, she implied that other English women should not be exposed to them. She felt they would be vulnerable to the advances of the remaining Chinese since no Chinese women accompanied these men. She believed that the mere association of her pupils with the Chinese would jeopardize their welfare and well-being.

Miss Robinson explained that several parents had appealed for her assistance in restraining their girls from associating openly with the Chinese. To her this was an

indication of the corruptive influence the Chinese had upon her pupils. Subsequently, questioning two of her pupils, Rose Jenner and Bessie Morgan, she discovered they had been absent from school. Robinson was aware that Mr. Wong King, Rose Jenner's brother-in-law, had asked them to accompany two Chinese men, who did not speak English, to the Crystal Palace. Mr. Wong King was a boarding house keeper by trade. The girls apparently missed the last train but returned home by cab. Miss Robinson stated "after this incident and although advice was given to the parent, Bessie Morgan was allowed to help Mrs. Wong King so that she had a Chinese baby before she was 16 years old."⁴²

Furthering her investigation, she questioned a few older girls (about seventeen or eighteen years old) concerning the whereabouts of their classmates. They told her that one of their friend's father had wanted her to marry a Chinese against her wishes. Having unsuccessfully obtained the aid of her friends, she announced that she was going to commit suicide. Later, she was placed in the care of Mrs. Wong King, and supposedly married the "Chinaman."⁴³ Miss Robinson felt that part of the story was true. She believed that Bessie's father and stepmother had abandoned the young woman when she had become involved in a "misadventure."

Miss Robinson conceded that due to the extreme poverty of the neighbourhood, provided no alternative for women than to work for the Chinese. The economic positions of parents who "allow their children to associate with the Chinese become better-off when the girls reach the age of 14 or 15, yet neither parent work more than previously."⁴⁴ Similarly, a member of the Care Committee questioned how these families obtained the necessities of life--the children were well and strong, the rent paid, etc.--despite their family's unemployment.

Chinese employment of young girls was another concern. Miss Robinson questioned why the Chinese always seemed to select young girls to work for them in the boarding houses. After interviewing Rose Jenner, Miss Robinson believed that working under those conditions was unsafe and endangered the girls. Despite the difficulty of persuading the girls to leave the district to go into "service," the girls usually preferred casual charing work. She observed that after the Chinese New Year's celebrations, "one finds that girls have left their places of business and become unsettled, refusing to go on with the original employment and preferring casual work in factories and charing."⁴⁵

Finally, Miss Robinson believed that the Chinese New Year's celebration greatly influenced the children. After staying up as late as two a.m., to see the displays, they came to school tired. Girls showed marked signs of having access to alcohol. The children received presents or money, ranging from pennies to two pounds. It appeared that the parents of one child, who supplied the Chinese with oil for their opium lamps, had received two pounds. Moreover, the children had observed the Chinese falling asleep on their rugs and beds after smoking opium.

Mr. Blair of the Education Office, in a letter to Miss Robinson, sympathized with her. He cautioned her that it was possible the press would print her allegations. He asked her to be careful who she spoke to concerning these allegations and admitted into the school.⁴⁶ In her response to Mr. Blair she informed him that Mr. McIntyre, an officer of the Public Control Department, had interviewed her about her allegations.

After Mr. McIntyre's left, the head Mistress of the Infants school reported that a six-year-old boy had fallen off his chair and was very sick.⁴⁷ The mother of the child explained that her son had drunk her whiskey. Miss Robinson felt that the statement was said to protect the Chinaman on whom she depended for a living.⁴⁸ Three days later, Mrs. Florrie Rees, the mother of the boy, testified before two witnesses. She said,

I did not believe him, and knowing that I had left a quarter bottle of whiskey in the cupboard in the kitchen, which had been given to me by the Chinese for myself and husband full of whiskey, I looked in the cupboard and found the bottle half empty. I showed him the bottle and said to him 'You got it from here.' He made no reply.⁴⁹

Mr. Jackson, of the LCC Education Department Chief Inspector's Branch, wrote a letter to a Dr. Kimmins, questioning the report made by Mr. McIntyre.⁵⁰ Jackson informed the Education Office that Mr. McIntyre's report differed from the original allegations made by Miss Robinson. He eventually divulged the names of the individuals involved and clarified the few points that differed. They were as follows: (a) Mr. McIntyre said that Miss Robinson knew of six young women who had "misconducted" themselves but none within the past nine months; (b) the young women who had been intoxicated with the Chinese were two O'Keefes, one Ellis girl besides the Infants boy, aged five, named Rees; (c) the families who became "prosperous"

because of their association with the Chinese were the Morgans, Kings and Drews; (d) Miss Robinson denied saying that the girls who had obtained places as domestics subsequently became prostitutes but the two Tompkins girls, living at Fifteen Limehouse Causeway, had taken up this profession; (e) Mr. and Mrs. Wong King, although separated, had been the source of the trouble. Finally the two pounds given as presents were given to Mrs. Stint's daughter.⁵¹ Mr. Jackson reported that Miss Robinson alleged that the girls left school at fourteen, and had babies by Chinamen before they were fifteen. In addition, Bessie Morgan, whose mother allowed her to clean the rooms and opium pipes of the Chinamen, had also been involved with the Chinamen.⁵² The girl's parents economic prosperity resulted in their cooperation with the Chinese through their daughter's immoral activities with them.⁵³ After receiving work from the Chinamen, the girls have no direction and eventually become prostitutes.⁵⁴ Finally, the report pointed out that two very rich people (supposedly Mr. and Mrs. Wong King) aided Chinamen in obtaining young girls.

The police investigated these allegations. F. R. Garnham, Inspector, working in the area for thirty years, stated that the Chinese were fond of children and frequently gave pence to them.⁵⁵ A Detective Inspector, who had worked in Limehouse for three years, reported a hundred-thirty Chinese residents, and two hundred living in various lodging houses. At times, as many as four hundred Chinese seamen were on shore.⁵⁶ He also reported that fifteen Chinese had married English women and four of them operated boarding houses. Furthermore, several others were living with English women, and no young girls were employed by the Chinese. The Chinese preferred married women and widows to work in the lodging houses. They did not employ women to clean their opium pipes. "They preferred to do it themselves!"⁵⁷ He described the Chinese community as "well-behaved and respectable." In response to Miss Robinson's allegations, he believed that the cause of the problem stemmed from the case of Mrs. Jenner whose three daughters had married⁵⁸

Mr. E. R. Henry, New Scotland Yard, sent a letter to the Clerk of the London County Council reporting the facts after his investigation. He stated that "the relations between Englishwomen and Chinese residents in the Limehouse . . . are not as deplorably bad as Miss Robinson makes out, and that they afford no grounds for the intervention of the police."⁵⁹

In the final police report, the following points were made in response to the

allegations of Miss Robinson. First, Bessie Morgan had married a Lim See Noon, a ship's steward by special license on 24 January 1911 and had one child.⁶⁰ Her husband had sent her money while he was away at sea for nineteen months. She was seventeen years old, and she never cleaned out opium pipes and was quite happily married.⁶¹

The second allegation concerning opium dens in London could not be proved by the police. The Chinese smoking opium did so in their bedrooms that could not be described as "opium dens." Mrs. Jenner's family was involved with "Chinamen." Her three daughters, Elizabeth, Georgina, and Ada had married "Chinamen," and were well and happy. They were legally married, either at the Registry Office or at Church and fully satisfied with their husbands. They confirmed that they had introduced Bessie Morgan to her husband.

The third allegation concerning the Chinese New Year's celebration also came under investigation. Chinese New Year's Day commenced at eleven p.m. and continued until two or three a.m. It was a fete customarily celebrated with fireworks and presents of drinks, sweetmeats, etc. given to friends and neighbours. Liquor was not given to children, but to their parents. The boy's mother said that her son had drunk it at home from a bottle given to her by the Chinaman. The mother officially said that the allegation was true.

Finally, the police found several young women associated with the Chinese. A Phyllis Moore, who had allegedly married a Chinese, was now twenty years of age. She had been confined on the 19 June 1908, at the age of sixteen. The man had offered to marry her. He had paid all her confinement expenses. She was an epileptic and lived in a workhouse. Another girl, named Edith Tomkins, had also given birth to children by Chinamen. She was now twenty years of age and admitted to having two children by a Chinaman, Tai Kan, when she was eighteen. Tai Kan wished to marry her, but she had refused. He continued to support her and the children during his absence and she intended to marry him on his return. The police believed that the case of Mrs. Jenner was the foundation of Miss Robinson's alarming report. Fourteen years previously, her English husband deserted and left with eight children. For thirteen years she had worked for the Chinese, and three of her daughters had married Chinamen. They were all happy and denied that anyone led them to have intercourse with Chinamen.⁶²

On 11 February, Miss Robinson had a meeting with Mr. H. A. Jury, Inspector

of Common Lodging Houses and Mr. F. Hartnoll, Inspector from the Public Health department. Shirley F Murphy, Medical Officer of Health to the Public Health Committee, investigated the allegations. She found that children were admitted to the licensed houses.⁶³ The investigation clarified the basic allegations and claimed the accusations were based on circumstantial and unsupported evidence.

The outcome of the investigation by New Scotland Yard, the Public Control Department, and Public Health Committee was that they clearly refused to accept the accusations made by Miss Robinson against the Chinese. When the investigation ended, Mr. Blair sent a letter to Sir Edward Henry, New Scotland Yard, saying that the police had made a few overstatements. He felt that the investigation uncovered "a very serious state of affairs."⁶⁴ From his investigation, which he later forwarded to New Scotland Yard on 20 February, the divorce proceedings relating to Charles King (Wong King) and Elizabeth King (Jenner) was a matter of interest. The dissolution of their marriage, reported in both *The Times* and *Daily Telegraph*, was the result of Mrs. Wong King's alleged adultery with another Chinaman. Eventually Mr. Wong King received custody of their two children. Mr. Blair believed that their family situation was more unsatisfactory as the police thought.⁶⁵ Finally, he reported that Miss Robinson should continue to monitor the situation. If she found any additional information, she should contact him.

A few conclusions can be drawn from Miss Robinson's report. First, she believed that the Chinese had an adverse effect on her pupils. She regarded the involvement of the parents with suspicion. Although unsubstantiated by the report, her concerns may have been provoked, not only as a school administrator for her pupils, but as one, who had strong prejudices against the Chinese or any other ethnic minority. If this is true, then here attitude towards Chinese children may also have been prejudiced. Finally, Robinson did not tell whether any Chinese or part-Chinese children were attending Gill Street LCC. It is conceivable that no Chinese children were then present.

In summary, the role of education is irrefutable. These institutions instill the fundamental of nationhood in the children. Cultural heritage, religious beliefs, literature, historical language, a common past, patterns of emotional expression, language inflection and pronunciation, and a multiplicity of cultural attitudes and traits influence their cultural assimilation. Cultural assimilation is retarded when children

attend parochial schools or ethnically enclosed schools. The unavailability of educational information concerning the second generation Chinese limited the research. Also, information concerning their professional and occupational attainment, their level of education beyond secondary school, etc. was not available.

THE CHINESE RESPONSE: MAINTENANCE OF CULTURAL TRADITION

The Chinese settlement, centred in the docklands, was not large. Primary relationship, for at least the immigrant Chinese, was isolated to his own ethnic group, British wife and children. Children born of mixed parentage, normally associated with their Chinese peer group and children at school. The immigrant or seamen's population continued to maintain its cultural traditions rather than accept the cultural values of the British. Evidence is set forth in the following sections to illustrate the Chinese's ethnic traditions and cultural values that curtailed cultural assimilation for the immigrant Chinese.

An article in the *Liverpool Courier* stated that the Chinese were ready to adapt to their new surroundings by accepting western habits of dress, and even sacrificing their "pigtails" by coiling it under their hat.⁶⁶ The first generation did not adapt intrinsically or extrinsically to their new environment. Outwardly one class, the Canton coolie, did adapt to "western dress," but most of the Chinese did not intend to make England their home.

They hoped to return to China with 120 pounds to start a new life.⁶⁷ The centre of their activities was in areas inhabited by other Chinese (Chinatown). Their self-imposed isolation from the British and their culturally inherent attitude of self-reliance influenced their disinterest in learning the English language and in assimilating into the new environment. This isolation only continued to preserve and perpetuate their ethnic values and culture.

Chinese Mutual Societies and Secret Orders

Associations formed by the Chinese were the *Chung Sam* Worker's Club (1920-21), *Tai Ping* Club (1948) [a *Hakka* organisation], and the *Wa Yam Tsau Lau Tsung Shung Wai* (The Association of Chinese Restaurateurs). *Chung Sam* Workers Club's objectives were "to unite overseas Chinese in England, to improve the working conditions of Chinese workers, and to look after their welfare."⁶⁸ Its membership of

approximately 250 was probably the largest in London.⁶⁹

Chi Kung Tong or Chinese Masonic Hall had an adverse influence on both the Chinese and British. Its members were often involved in brawls in the docklands that ruined the reputation of the Chinese community.⁷⁰ In the 1900's, the *Tong* vigorously supported the overthrow of the Manchu leaders in China.⁷¹

A few Chinese associations were "secret" orders. On 18 April 1912, a general melee erupted in West India Dock Road. The Chinese involved wielded weapons such as hammers and iron bars. One man had a revolver. Apparently, a dispute ensued between two rival organisations, the Nautical Progress Society and the White Lily Society of China.⁷² It was believed that the society extended throughout China. Actions were directed against an individual or individuals who were a threat to the organisation.⁷³

In strength, the society exceeded the Masonic Order. Leaders of each group met and agreed that no further disturbances would occur. Some men were sent to Amsterdam, and others went to sea. The remaining men were remanded for a week at the Old Bailey.⁷⁴ In 1920, the *Daily Express* reported the existence of a powerful Chinese syndicate in the East End of London.⁷⁵ The groups' objectives were the propagation of vice, the promotion of the pernicious opium trade, and the operation of gambling houses. Most sinister, however, was the corruption of women and children of the Chinese lottery game know as puck-a-boo.⁷⁶ Peking or Hong Kong was the headquarters of the syndicate. The authorities imprisoned and eventually deported any member they caught. The police did not find the leader in Britain.⁷⁷

Gambling

The Chinese were addicted to gambling. The police described the Chinese as born gamblers, who sometimes lost the whole of their hard-earned wages and all their personal property at a single sitting.⁷⁸ Largely, gambling was conducted by "a well-financed syndicate."⁷⁹ One correspondent said that if a Chinese coolie had any inclination towards gambling, a telegram would be dispatched to other Chinese in Cardiff, London, and elsewhere, summoning them to the game. By the next train members of the syndicate would arrive, eager to share in the spoils.⁸⁰ The Stipendiary stated, in respect to gambling, "these foreigners were only doing what they were allowed to do in their own country [and] it was a pity under the circumstances that the

authorities could shut their eyes to it."⁸¹ Although the Chinese were not posing a major problem for the police, they became the focal point for the local and national members of the government. For example, in 1872, the Hong Kong Government issued the following notification:

In reference to Government Notification No. 149 of the 23d of November 1870, notice is hereby given that the gaming-house licenses will be put up for auction, in lieu of the drawing of lots, at 2 p.m. on the 12th inst., at the Government offices, the conditions under which the auction will be held are hereunto annexed. By Command, J. Gardiner Austin, Colonial Secretary, Colonial Secretary; Office, Hongkong, Jan 6, 1871.⁸²

Under British law, gambling was legal in Hong Kong. From the viewpoint of the Chinese law gambling was a crime. Chinese officials went to extremes to enforce the law. They even razed houses and tortured landlords trying to suppress this practice. A newspaper correspondent stated that the British Government's attempt to auction public gambling-house licenses was to generate revenue.⁸³ He continued by saying that "no Government in the world that makes more revenue from licensed gambling than that of China."⁸⁴ The article then described the different forms of the lottery practised in China.

The British Government was not sympathetic or tolerant to the "cultural" aspects of gambling for the Chinese. Often, Chinese were arrested for being involved in gambling. One such incident was reported in *The Times*, saying that the police arrested thirty-one Chinamen in Cardiff.⁸⁵ The Stipendiary recommended fines or deportation for some Chinese men.⁸⁶ The only crime resulting from gambling was the case of Ping Long who was hanged in 1904 for the murder of Co Hing. Their argument arose out of a gambling fraud in a boarding house.⁸⁷ Reports in the *East End News* in 1917 and 1918 show that the police constantly raided gaming houses in Pennyfields (Poplar). In one instance, one person was fined and faced imprisonment for gambling.⁸⁸

Opium

Besides gambling, the Chinese were rumoured to be addicted to opium. In 1906, police in Birkenhead found three shops that sold opium but no one was found in the street suffering the effects of opium smoking.⁸⁹ The government, in spite of its intention to eradicate the use of opium, was impotent in curtailing the problem until the Defence of the

Realm Act (1916) was passed. This Act gave the police more power to restrain the use of this drug. In addition, under the Act, it was an offense for anyone to be found in possession of opium in any form unless he was an authorised person.⁹⁰ Opium continued to be used through the Fifties. One commission reported that opium smoking was principally the leisure past time of the Chinese seamen and only a few Chinese were using the drug.⁹¹

These activities and their habit of opium smoking kindled and fuelled the highly volatile situation between the Chinese and the Seamen Union. This ultimately influenced the attitudes of the British as well. Opium smoking, gambling and the intrigue of the "mystic Easterner" fascinated many citizens living outside the seamen's community. In December 1920, and undoubtedly at other times, sightseers visited Chinatown. They were "thrilled when they rubbed shoulders with the quiet and inoffensive Chinese sailor men who stood about on the pavement waiting . . . to get a ship."⁹²

Mother-tongue Education

Some Chinese in the community felt that the education of their children should focus on learning their own cultural heritage. A group of wealthy Chinese and the Anglo-Chinese Bureau planned to open a language school for the children and to help Chinese men to learn English.⁹³ The education Committee, allowed them to use the classroom facilities at Dingle Lane School. A Mr. B. Shen and Mr. Yong, two members of the community, enlisted graduates who could "teach their own tongue"⁹⁴ The two shopkeepers with additional money contributed by the community funded the school. About forty children and fifty adults registered for the courses.⁹⁵

Chinese students in London were also interested in establishing an evening school for Anglo-Chinese children.⁹⁶ Fifty Anglo-Chinese children enrolled in a special evening school. They learned Chinese characters, writing, the history and geography of China and to take pride in their paternal parents' country. The Chinese committee recruited a teacher, a Miss Neum, who had recently returned from work as a missionary in China.⁹⁷ Most of the children expressed a desire to visit China when they grew up.⁹⁸

Other Christian groups became concerned about the welfare of the Chinese but their efforts were ineffective. Between 1930-1932, the Church of England convened a Commission on Orientals in England. Later, in December 1932, the Commission asked a Miss Crosby to find out the number of Chinese in England.⁹⁹ Unfortunately, she was unable to undertake the preparation of such a report¹⁰⁰. Eventually, the Committee decided

not to proceed with the report on the Chinese in England.

A *HAVAS* dispatch reported that, in December 1934, several dozen Chinese children were present at the opening of the *Chung Hwa School*.¹⁰¹ The school was established to teach the children living in the East End of London "their own language, customs, culture and folklore."¹⁰² Miss Quo Tai-chi, Minister of the Court of St. James, opened the school. In 1934, Miss Tsi-Dsi Irene Ho, the daughter of Sir Robert Ho Tung founded the *Chung Hwa School and Club* (Pennyfields) to help the families of Chinese sailors married to English women.¹⁰³ Activities provided for the children were first aid classes, tennis and swimming, amateur dramatic sketches (*Mencius was a Naughty Boy*), and an employment bureau. The boys were involved in Scouts, gymnastics and boxing, and the girls participated in Girl Guides, needlework and cooking.¹⁰⁴ The impending war eventually curtailed all the activities of the school.

In summary, the immigrant Chinese did not assimilate. They were content to remain Chinese despite intermarriages with British women. Their children, however, being raised British, acquired English as their first language and accepted the cultural norms of the British society. They were British! They did not attend any parochial school, ethnic institution, special social cliques or voluntary religious organisations for educational or social purposes that isolated them from their British peers.

Limehouse provided a "sanctuary" where the Chinese could remain enclosed in their own community. The children were raised with other ethnic minorities and with the local British population. This population of Chinese remained geographically isolated from other parts of the more affluent areas of the city. Yet, the educational system did provide adequate instruction as a few of the second generation Chinese could acquire additional training. Without question, the impact of the educational system besides the influence of their British parent, had a strong influence towards cultural assimilation.

The next Chapter will continue the study of the Chinese in this period (1900-1950) by investigating their structural assimilation. The focus will be on structural assimilation as it relates to settlement and employment of the Chinese.

CHAPTER IV

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: 1900-1950

INTRODUCTION

Chapter III examined the cultural assimilation of the Chinese between 1900-1950 to determine the intrinsic and extrinsic values they acquired, that influenced their assimilation. Cultural assimilation, which occurred in varying degrees, was influenced by the educational attainment of the second generation Chinese. This Chapter will examine structural assimilation through settlement and employment, the response of the British society, and the Chinese response during 1900-1950.

SETTLEMENT

Settlement is an important indicator of structural assimilation. It shows a minority group's successful mobility from ethnically enclosed neighbourhoods by moving into the broader core society. This section will focus on the Chinese community in London, Liverpool and Birkenhead. Further study will examine the circumstances that influenced Chinese assimilation as their community grew through the establishment of friendships, frequent home inter-visiting, communal worship and communal recreation.

The London Chinese Community

In 1885, the Chinese community in London evolved on one street--Limehouse Causeway--which was next to the West India Docks. Most Chinese lived in boarding houses that provided, not only living accommodations, but social activities, such as gambling and opium smoking.

As the Chinese settlement and population grew, two separate groups emerged within the community--permanent residents and transient sailors. The latter community population fluctuated according to the number of ships arriving and departing from British ports. As time passed, the permanent Chinese population consisted of those who "jumped ship," left their employment as seamen, or had immigrated from China to seek employment in Britain.

Statistics concerning the Chinese population changed according to various sources. In 1911, 668 Chinese lived in London.¹ Yet in November 1911, the police recorded two hundred eighty-six male residents, three female residents and one hundred ninety-five seamen and forty-four laundries in the city.² Approximately three thousand Chinese lived in Britain.

By 1913, the community had expanded to include Penneyfields, Limehouse Causeway, and two small streets that ran off on opposite sides of the West India Dock-road. Thirty shops and restaurants and a fluctuating population of Chinese, numbering about three or four hundred lived in this area.³ The Chinese community was described by the police to be excellent and clean. Overcrowding had been controlled and violent crimes were rare. None were destitute because the community helped on another.⁴

During the First World War, the population of the Chinese declined. On 13 December 1920, *The Manchester Guardian* reported that an extraordinary thing had occurred in Chinatown.⁵ For twelve hundred seamen who had crowded the lodging houses two months previously, the numbers had increased by 150. Many of these were new arrivals from Cardiff and Liverpool who believed their chances of employment was better in London.

Even the government was unsure about the Chinese population. Debates continued in government circles. Sir E. Wild claimed that the action of the magistrate and press reduced the population of the Limehouse Chinese colony from four thousand to three hundred. Mr. Cairns, the Magistrate at Thames Police Court, rejected the claim because he had noticed no appreciable difference in the population of Chinatown within the last twelve months.⁶ A Divisional Inspector of the police stated that Limehouse and that Pennyfields were like country villages, and the people living in Chinatown were quieter and law-abiding than any time in the last 12 years.⁷

The Liverpool Community

The Liverpool Chinese community developed around Pitt Street, Cleveland Square and Frederick Street. Under the direction of the Earl of Chatham, Pitt Street had initially been constructed through the 1740 dock expansion programme. The solidly-built houses were as homes. As trade decreased, the mansions of wealthy landlords were converted into "shops, taverns, eating-houses, and more questionable places of entertainment . . . and Jack of all nations here lodged between long voyages,

royally spending his money."⁸ The decreasing number of sailors caused the eventual decline of Pitt-street.⁹ Africans, Jews, Scandinavians, Spaniards, Greeks, Armenians, Levantines, Moroccans, Assyrians also lived there.

On one side of Cleveland Street existed a pugilistic club, Chinese restaurant, shops with foreign names and Asian children playing in the streets.¹⁰ They were attractive offsprings of white women who had mated with Negroes, Manilla men, Chinese and Malays.¹¹ Chinese, Negroes and Scandinavians mainly settled on Frederick Street. A Liverpool Commission suggested that the Chinese quarter of Liverpool, which was in Cleveland Square, excluding several laundries scattered throughout the city, accommodated the whole Chinese population.¹²

The Chinese Community of Liverpool (1906)		
Table 4		
Date	Number of Chinese	Number of Chinese Residents
March 1906	337 Chinamen	100 Residents
December 1906	356 Chinamen	224 Residents

United Kingdom, Home Office, *Report of the Head Constable of Liverpool*, 8 December 1906, HO45 11843/139147/15.

Since the Chinese formed a small minority in Liverpool, the government was disinterested in them. Their numbers were so small that they were not separately numerated in *Annual Reports* under the Aliens Acts.¹³ During the first quarter of 1906, the population was three hundred thirty-seven, consisting of only one hundred permanent residents, working as boarding house keepers, shopkeepers or launderers.¹⁴ Of the one hundred, only three or four had married English women.

The Liverpool police reported to the Home Office that approximately one hundred Chinese living onboard ship, particularly on the Blue Funnel Lines of Messrs. Alfred Holt. Most seamen were sent to a boarding house to await a transfer to another ship. A report In 1907 showed that the Chinese were included in the category of "other nationalities" consisting of two hundred eighty-two persons. Furthermore, no Chinese appeared before the Immigration Board at Liverpool in 1907. Only one Chinese, living in London was naturalised in 1907.¹⁵ By 1911, five hundred and two Chinese lived in Liverpool.¹⁶

The Chinese Community in Liverpool: 8 December 1906	
Table 5	
49	Laundries
7	Shops
13	Boarding Houses
4	Dwelling Houses
224	Resident Chinese
132	Chinamen in boarding houses
1	Chinese woman
1	Women born of Chinese father and English mother
15	English women married to Chinamen
4	English women cohabiting with Chinamen
2	English women employed in Chinese laundries

United Kingdom, Home Office, *Report of Head Constable of Liverpool*, 8 December 1906, HO45/11843/139147/8.

The Chinese in Liverpool came from different provinces in China. The majority were of the Canton Coolie class who came from the province of Canton. Others came from the Northern ports of China,¹⁷ in the provinces of Foochoo and Hainan. As a result, three distinct dialects were spoken.

The Birkenhead Chinese Community

A report regarding the disposition of the Chinese in the Borough of Birkenhead, near Liverpool, was submitted by the Chief Constable.¹⁸ He reported that sixty-five Chinese lived there. By 1911, the number of Chinese had decreased to sixty-three.¹⁹ In addition 1,748 Chinese were employed on three steamer lines mooring at Birkenhead. The general onshore population of Chinese averaged hundred-twenty seamen. The community was also described as "quite, inoffensive, and industrious their morals are no worse than those of the rest of the community."²⁰

Birkenhead resembled Liverpool. A few Chinese—about 5 and 7 percent of the Chinese community, worked as seamen or launderers, shop keepers, or boarding house keepers. One significant insight into the Birkenhead Chinese community was that only one Chinese person owned property. It can be assumed that the remaining Chinese were living in either rented accommodations or boarding houses. This suggests that the Chinese did not want to purchase property because they were not planning to remain in Britain. For those who married local British women, however, the purchasing of

property was determined by their personal finances, as will be explained.

The Borough of Birkenhead 31 March 1906 Table 6	
65	Chinamen
5	Married to English Wives
3	Have families of 5,3,2, children
4	Chinamen live with English women but nor married
0	Chinese women
14	Laundries kept by Chinamen
4	Chinese employees
4	Small general shops
2	Boarding houses
1	Private house in the occupation of Chinamen
	Opium is sold at 3 small shops

United Kingdom, Home Office, *Report from the Chief Constable of Birkenhead*, 7 December 1906, HO45/11843/139147/7.

The Acquisition and Leasing of Property

Spatial mobility or the movement of the Chinese from an ethnically enclosed community to the broader British society will be examined in this section. Movement into other parts of London, primarily through property ownership, suggests that the Chinese had become economically stable and possessed enough money to purchase property. Furthermore, the records revealed the names of tenants living in a specific location, showing where they lived or had their businesses during this period–1900-1950.

Metropolitan Borough of Poplar Valuations Table 7		
Year	Chinese Renters	Chinese Owners
1915	21	0
1920	90	1

Metropolitan Borough of Polar, The Parish of Polar Borough, *Valuations Lists of 1910, 1915, 1918, and 1921*.

The permanent Chinese living in the East End of London lived in leased accommodations while the transient seamen’s community lived in boarding houses.

The *Record of Valuations* for the London County Council (1870-1910) in the Borough of Tower Hamlets could not be found. The *Record of Valuations* of 1910 showed one Chinese boarding house keeper renting a building in Stepney.²¹ In Limehouse Causeway, five Chinese leased several buildings either for homes or as businesses from their English owners, Mr. White, Mr. Edgar, Mr. Dainton and Mr. Bonner.²² No Chinese leased or owned any property in the West India Dock Road area.²³

The evidence suggests that only a few Chinese owned property. In 1916, *The Times* reported one unusual case. A Kai Chong, who had married a British woman, was brought before a magistrate.²⁴ Chong had made an agreement to purchase a house but voided it. He thought he had purchased the property as freehold²⁵ and had given the plaintiff's agent a deposit and a diamond ring. The property in question was in the centre of the Chinese quarter of London. It had been occupied by a Polish barber the previous year. Chong had been informed that he could have a 50-year lease for 250 pounds, and a ground rent of 5 pounds a year. According to the plaintiff, the question of freehold never arose.

Metropolitan Borough of Poplar Valuations Table 8		
Year	Chinese Renters	Chinese Owners
1925	50	1
1930	55	1
1935	46	0

Metropolitan Borough of Polar, The Parish of Polar Borough, *Valuations Lists of 1925, 1930, and 1935.*

These accusations can be verified through the valuation registers. The properties in question centred primarily in the Limehouse Causeway district and Pennyfields, where most of the Chinese resided. As the years passed, the Chinese population in Limehouse gradually declined. The result of this decline can be shown by the number of properties leased in Pennyfields by the British or other ethnic groups, as compared with the Chinese leasing properties in the same area. An examination of the 1915, 1920, 1925, 1930, and 1935 *Valuation List for the Metropolitan Borough of Popular*, showed that two or three individuals owned property. All the other Chinese leased accommodations for their families and businesses.²⁶

In 1915, Chinese leasing property represented 52 percent (eleven),²⁷ and 49 percent (forty-four) in 1920.²⁸ About one-third of the properties were used jointly as homes and shops. During 1915, eight out of twenty-one people leased resident-shops. In 1920, thirty-two resident-shops, one boarding house, and one laundry were rented to the Chinese in the Pennyfields area.

The Chinese renting property in Poplar represented 68 percent (34 percent) in 1925;²⁹ 76 percent (42 percent) in 1930;³⁰ and 80 (37 percent) in 1935.³¹ Most properties leased from British landlords were used for residential dwellings. In 1925, twenty resident-shops and one boarding house existed in Limehouse. By 1930, the number of resident-shops decreased to seventeen. Finally in 1935 thirteen resident-shops, one boarding house, and one restaurant remained.³² Because of the war, seventeen dwellings were damaged or destroyed by enemy bombardment.

In 1936, city planners hoped to beautify the Limehouse district by building new commercial and residential buildings. A decision was made to modernise Limehouse by tearing down 39,000 square feet and replace the outdated structures.³³ The intention was to build 10,000 new flats a year in the East End and build an arterial road through Limehouse.³⁴ The development required that residents move. Most the Chinese community who had lived in the area for several years, some more than thirty years, did not want to move. Many families, however, eventually moved from Pennyfields. By the 1950s most of the initial Chinese residents had gone to other parts of the city. The Chinese community in Limehouse ended in this way.

In summary, the Chinese population was established through the port cities of Britain. A few Chinese purchased property, but the majority lived in rented housing and neighbourhoods close to other Chinese. Spatial mobility did not occur. The Chinese remained in their ethnic neighbourhoods, moving only when they needed to find employment in other port cities, or on ships leaving Britain. After the war, many original Chinatown residents left, and their place was eventually filled by other immigrant groups.

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: EMPLOYMENT

This section will examine the structural assimilation of the Chinese through their employment as seamen, launderers, boarding house keepers, or restaurant owners. D. Caradog Jones, *The Social Survey of Merseyside* show an occupational status table.³⁵

The economic status, social position and lack of educational attainment of the Chinese, placed them on the bottom level of this table, as unskilled manual workers. Of the nine occupational grades, a seaman fell into the eighth grade of unskilled manual workers. In essence, the Chinese possessed very few skills, Most Chinese, who were considered unskilled labourers (fifth grade) became shopkeepers, boarding house keepers, and launderers. Their choice of employment was due to their lack of education, occupational training, and perhaps, to a lack of English language skills.

Occupational Grades Table 9	
Grade 1	Highest professional, administrative and business posts.
Grade 2	School teachers.
Grade 3	Lower professional, Commercial, Technical, and managerial posts (e.g. Commercial Travellers, Specialized clerks, Master Mariners, Customs Officers).
Grade 4	Ordinary clerks.
Grade 5	Shop-assistants and minor commercial posts (e.g. Insurance Agents, small shopkeepers).
Grade 6a	Manual workers in supervisory positions (e.g. Foremen, Police Sergeants).
Grade 6b	Skilled Manual Workers (e.g. Plumbers, Fitters, Boilermakers).
Grade 7	Semi-skilled manual workers (e.g. Carters, firemen, motor drivers).
Grade 8	Unskilled Manual Workers (e.g. General Labourers, Cockers, Seamen).
Grade 9	Those who are chronically unfit for work, mentally or physically, and those who appear to have been employed for some years and are now without a recorded occupation.

D. Caradog Jones, *The Social Survey of Merseyside*, (University Press of Liverpool, Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., V 2, 1934), 406.

Employment as Seamen

By 1900, the private shipping companies had a growing trade in the Far East and Asia and required many foreign seamen to meet the demands of business. Private shipping companies and the East India Company usually hired foreign nationals in their home ports. In the 19th century, enlistment of other foreign seamen far exceeded the number of Chinese working on British vessels. As a result, the Chinese seamen’s population was usually included in the Lascar population.

One report suggests that by 1911 only 480 Chinese out of a population of 15,246 foreign seamen remained in Britain.³⁶ The *Census for Seamen* reported for the same period that there were 29,628 foreign seamen, excluding Lascars, serving on British vessels.³⁷ Also, employed in the Mercantile Marines were Lascar and Asiatic seamen who numbered 170,052.³⁸ During the same period, 42,905 Lascars as compared with 99,103 British seamen lived in Britain. British seamen still represented the largest percentage of engagements while the Chinese represented merely one to 3 percent. Total engagements for other foreign seamen were between 10 and 15 percent.

Number of Engagement: Chinese Seamen on British Foreign-going Ships in Ports of the United Kingdom ³⁹ Table 10			
Name of the Port on Mercantile Marine Office	Engagements of Chinese Seamen		
	1911	1912	1913
Blythe	----	34	17
Cardiff	357	593	795
Barry	796	746	861
Penarth	137	95	82
Glasgow	219	177	212
Liverpool	1,357	1,751	2,651
London--			
Dock Street	90	274	154
Victoria Docks	232	287	268
Poplar	808	1,028	742
Tilbury	16	74	2
Middlesborough	42	83	121
Newcastle	15	47	141
Newport	183	263	246
Shields, North	504	597	812
Shields, South	99	425	530
Sunderland	24	132	233
Southampton	61	----	----
Other ports		519	1,031
TOTAL	5,366	7,450	9,286

The Seaman, 13 June 1913.

In 1912, 1,751 Chinese resided in Liverpool and 1,130 living in London.⁴⁰ The Sailors' and Firemen's Union also endeavoured to keep statistics on the Chinese population. Mr. J H Boarlase, a representative of the *Manchester Evening Chronicle* interviewed a local representative of the Seamen's Union. He stated that 55,000

Chinese seamen worked on the merchant ships. The number was increasing at the rate of 7,000 to 8,000 per year.⁴¹

Chinese seamen repeated engagements onboard British foreign-going ships at ports in the United Kingdom for the years 1911-1913 was as follows: 5,366, 7,450, and 9,286.⁴² This suggests an increase in the number of men employed on British vessels. During this period, the Chinese represented 10 percent, 13 percent and 14.7 percent of the engagements. Of the 9,286 engagements in 1914, 2,651 were engaged in Liverpool, which was approximately 11,000 more than the previous year.⁴³

Numbers and Percentages of British and Foreign Seamen Engaged at All Mercantile Marine Offices (1911-1918) Table 11									
Year	British		Foreigners & Other than Asiatics & Other Asiatics				& Africans		TOTAL
	No.	%	Africans No.	%	Chinese No.	%	No.	%	
1911	503,689	90.51	42,316	7.60	5,366	0.96	5,122	0.93	556,493
1912	514,032	90.01	43,878	7.68	7,450	1.30	5,556	0.98	570,916
1913	541,830	89.59	47,269	7.81	9,286	1.53	6,475	1.07	604,830
1914	500,423	89.0	46,116	8.1	8,182	1.5	7,546	1.4	562,267
1915	384,602	83.2	55,269	11.7	14,224	3.2	8,614	1.9	462,709
1916	348,432	83.85	44,634	10.7	11,598	2.79	11,953	2.64	415,617
1917	305,567	82.92	38,761	10.5	11,321	3.07	12,863	3.49	368,512
1918	312,257	86.72	25,506	7.08	10,781	2.99	11,535	3.2	360,182

The Seaman, 28 March 1919.

During the First World War (1914-1918) the British government extended the use of Chinese seamen, due to British seamen enlisting in the military. The government and the Seamen’s Union temporarily, at least for the duration of the War, relented and employed the Chinese seamen.⁴⁴ They hired them and other foreigners to fill the vacancies left by the British seamen. They worked in the shipping industry and in the military factories and installations.

In 1915, their employment reached its peak with 3.2 percent or 14,224 of the total 462,709 engagements.⁴⁵ A gradual decline in engagements occurred between 1916-1918. The total work for all seamen also declined from 562,267 (1914) to 360,182 (1918), a 36 percent decrease, reflecting the effect of the War on trade. By

March 1923, the number of Chinese engaged on ships had sharply declined. Of 115,916 engagements during the first quarter (January to March), 108,968 or 94.01 percent were British seamen and only 468 Chinese received engagements.⁴⁶

Registered British seamen in 1923 were 207,000. The number was later readjusted to consider sickness, disability, etc. of the seamen, leaving a balance of 183,862.⁴⁷ A total of 9,902 foreign seamen represented 5.1 percent of the Mercantile Merchant Marines. Four groupings categorised the foreign seamen, 4,684 "other than Asiatics and Africans"; 536 Chinese; 2,230 Arabs, and 2,452 "Other Asiatics and Africans."⁴⁸

Engagements of British and Foreign Seamen at the Mercantile Marine Offices in the United Kingdom during the Quarter Ending 31 March 1923 Table 12									
Year	British		Africans		Chinese		Africans		TOTAL
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
March	108,968	94.01	3,299	2.85	268	0.40	3,181	2.74	115,916

The Seaman, 15 June 1923.

Many factors contributed to the decrease of Chinese labour. These were the devastating effects of the War on Britain's economy, the need to re-employ British seamen, pressures by the Seamen's Union and the government's posture to limit the use of Chinese seamen. These had a noticeable impact on the employment of Chinese seamen. After 1925 through the thirties, little mentioned was made of the Chinese in *The Seamen*.

Engagements of the Chinese seamen continued to decrease. During the last quarter of 1928, only 458 Chinese were employed on British vessels.⁴⁹ Over the year, only 1,610 engagements as compared with the 551,557 appointments of British seamen were received by the Chinese seamen.⁵⁰ In 1929, a Lieutenant Commander Kenworthy, providing evidence concerning Chinese seamen suggested that the number of Chinese had decreased from fourteen thousand to two thousand.⁵¹ Kenworthy testified, "they cannot speak the local dialect of Hong Kong but still declare they are British subjects."⁵²

Engagements of British and Foreign Seamen at the Mercantile Marine Offices in the United Kingdom During the Quarter Ending 31 March 1928 Table 13											
Foreigners & Other than Asiatics & Other Asiatics											
Year 1928	British		Asiatics		Chinese		Arabs		Africans		TOTAL
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No	%	No.	%	
Dec	129686	95	3054	2	458	0	1598	1.1	1712	1	136508
	551557	95	4054	2	1610	0	6690	1.1	7357	1	581268

The Seaman, January 1929.

The Chinese had 377 engagements (32 percent) by the fourth quarter of 1930, as compared with 458 in the same quarter, two years earlier.⁵³ Chinese engagements were limited until the outbreak of World War II. Yet, the government continued to recruit Chinese seamen because of the unfilled vacancies left by British seamen. After the war, many of these seamen were eventually repatriated, while others intermarried and remained in Britain.

Employment in the Munitions and Aerodrome Factories

During 1914-1918, besides filling the positions vacated by British seamen, the British munitions and aerodrome factories hired the Chinese, with other foreigners, to work for them. Britain was not the only country using Chinese labour. In a letter sent by the Ministry of Shipping on 24 September 1917 it said that 10,000 Chinese Coolies were being transported from North China to France per month.⁵⁴ The War Office recruited and enlisted Chinese coolies from North China. They also considered employing a Chinese Pioneer Battalion on the Western Front, provided the government employed either French, Chinese or Japanese tonnage.⁵⁵ The Ministry of Shipping was unconcerned about the increase of work at the "front," or of sending coolies to Mesopotamia or other theatres of war. They were more concerned about the difficulty of providing tonnage.⁵⁶

A serious need for labourers developed in defence-related industries. On 31 January 1918, the government hired a total of 372 Chinese for munitions work. When compared with the total foreign labour force of 43,005 alien workers, the Chinese represented an insignificantly small fraction of foreign labourers.⁵⁷ After they were

discharged or left their employment, many returned to the port cities to seek employment in the shipping industry. Some opened shops. Others left the country.

When the War was over, the government sent many Chinese and foreigners home. Gradually Britons, returning from the War, replaced Chinese labour. By 1918, according to one survey, the Chinese population decreased in London and Liverpool had decreased.⁵⁸ The total number of Chinese on shore was 4,115 which included both the permanent and transient Chinese population. As a result, the lodging-houses were empty. Some lodging houses turned into shops. Restaurants closed. Ships, previously manned almost entirely by Chinese, were leaving Britain. Unhappily for the men who earned their living on the sea, they had to return to a Chinese port to receive their payments.⁵⁹

Employment in Boarding Houses

The Chinese always established boarding houses, worked in restaurants, or laundries.⁶⁰ The employment status of some Chinese as boarding house keepers continued to depict the Chinese as possessing few skills. As the numbers of Chinese increased on shore, the need for lodging also became a priority, especially when the seamen were anxious to live with their fellow compatriots.

It appears that the Chinese became involved in the boardinghouse business in London before 1900. The *London Post Office Directory (1894)* shows an O'You Kee operating a boarding house at 12 Limehouse Causeway.⁶¹ An examination of the Magistrate Court Records confirms the names of lodging-house keepers. No records showed Chinese convicted of any infraction of lodging house rules between January 1895 and April 1903. The *London Post Office Directory (1903)*, did show an Ahon Chang, as a boarding house keeper at 57 Upper North Street, Poplar. He was the proprietor.⁶² After 1905, the Chinese boarding house keepers were fined repeatedly for overcrowding their premises, also for other offenses that will be discussed later.

Although they were prohibited to act as intermediaries between the shipowners and the seamen, some boardinghouse keepers ignored this regulation and helped the shipowner secure crews for their vessels. They also provided for the general welfare of the seamen. Mr. Winston Churchill informed Mr. J. Havelock Wilson, President of the Sailors' and Seamen's Union of his concern over the responsibility of the boarding house keeper. He said that the Chinese boardinghouse keeper supplying Chinese crews

would receive no access to the Board of Trade.⁶³ Furthermore, he would prosecute any boardinghouse keeper, if sufficient evidence was available, under Section 111 or 112 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894.⁶⁴

List of Person Licensed to Seamen's Lodging Houses in the County of London 1907-1929 Table 14						
Year Ending	Chinese	Other	Total	Chinese Lodgers	Other	Total
1907	30		30			
1908	16	64	80	160		
1910	13	45	58	133	1195	1328
1911	5	28	33	90	1031	1121
1912	8	28	36	141	1033	1174
1913	8	33	41	143	923	1066
1914	8	35	43	139	976	1115
1915	6	25	33	143	882	1025
1916	7	29	36	151	945	1096
1917	9	47	56	205	1080	1285
1918	9	48	57	208	1255	1463
1919	7	42	49	159	1216	1375
1920	6	40	46	142	1037	1179
1922	3	?	?	71	?	?
1923	3	41	44	67	1103	1170
1924	4	33	37	98	989	1087
1925	3	35	38	67	1063	1130
1929	2	24	26	35	861	896

London County Council, *Licensing*, PH/reg/1/23 and PH/Reg/1/19

In London, beginning in 1910 and continuing through 1929, the primary location of the licensed lodging houses was in Pennyfields, Limehouse Causeway, and West India Dock Road. The growth of boarding houses became a particular concern to the British. In Cardiff, during the year of 1908, boarding houses increased from none to seven.⁶⁵ The report drew attention to the growth of the Chinese community that had supplanted the Italian, Arab and Turk populations. It stated that between 200 and 300 Chinamen always lived on shore, and "if the increase of Chinese remained constant, a new boarding house would be established every month or two."⁶⁶ Mr. Havelock Wilson's biased report said that the growth of the Chinese boarding houses in London

had increased tremendously from approximately thirteen, a few years previously, to between 400 and 500.⁶⁷

Despite the attempts of anti-Chinese groups, who tried to curb the rise in the Chinese population, the Chinese community continued to expand. The total number of boarding houses throughout the United Kingdom increased accordingly. By 1909 twenty existed in Limehouse. Lodging houses expanded from Limehouse Causeway and Pennyfields into other streets. Many Englishmen regarded the invasion as an extremely serious threat to their community.

Following the London County Council Merchant Shipping Act of 1894, the local council raised queries concerning the licensing of boarding houses. During 1910, the Council passed an order to compulsory license all seamen lodging houses. As a result, the number of Chinese operated boarding houses plummeted from 307 to 133 by 1910.

The Metropolitan police at the Limehouse station, kept a close surveillance on the Chinese community. On 27 July 1916, they provided a list of Chinese lodging houses in London to the Home Office.⁶⁸ A total of seven licensed lodging houses, with a capacity of housing 151 lodgers, was reported to the Council: three in Poplar, and the remaining four in Stepney.

List of Chinese Lodging Houses in London Metropolitan Police: Limehouse Station (1916) Table 15	
Poplar/Limehouse Causeway Pennyfields, Poplar West India Dock Road, Limehouse Birchfield St., Poplar Burdett Road, Limehouse	Canton Street, Poplar Castor Street, Limehouse Dod Street, Limehouse High Street, Poplar Rich Street, Poplar Tidal Basin Road, Custom House

United Kingdom, Home Office, *Report of the Chief Constable* (Limehouse), 27 July 1916, HO/11843/139147/87.

From 1911 to 1920, the Chinese boarding houses accounted for approximately 13 to 19 percent of the licensed lodgings for seamen. After 1922 until 1929 the boarding houses decreased more sharply, probably due to the decline in Chinese seamen in London. The Chinese-seamen tenants, compared with seamen living in boarding

houses, represented between six and 11 percent of the total.

By its nature employment as boarding house keepers isolated the Chinese from the British society. Sometimes, a few Chinese even risked prosecution by establishing unlicensed boarding house to maintain their ethnic activities and culture. Their desire for separate communal activities--gambling, opium smoking, eating their ethnic foods, etc.--implied that structural assimilation had not happened in any quantitative measure. For many of them, the boarding house provided a "buffer" between two distinct cultures, which encouraged the Chinese to retain their cultural patterns while away from their homeland.

Employment as Launderers

Initially, the Chinese seamen developed the laundry business when they left their shipping occupation. As early as 1900, it was reported that several Chinese laundrymen had been left destitute, without food or wages for several weeks, by their employers.⁶⁹ In October 1900, one reader wrote a letter to the *Times* about the growing colony of Chinese living in London. He cautioned the readers that the Chinese were potential threats to the working class and trade unions.⁷⁰ He said that more than forty Chinese were working at a laundry in Stephen Street, Tottenham Court Road; another Chinese laundry had started in Great Portland Street, and another one in Hendon. He concluded by stating:

Now, the industrial invasion of any country by Chinese is an evil, as the United States and our colonies have proved by putting a poll-tax on them, [and] our working classes and trade unions at home will probably . . . keep them out when they realise the danger is real and threatening.⁷¹

In the 1901 Census, twenty-seven Chinese were in the laundry and washing service.⁷² The residents of North Street, Poplar, were extremely concerned over the arrival of a dozen Chinese, who had ostensibly arrived to open a laundry.⁷³

In 1906, a missionary to the Chinese in London, Reverend George Piercy, represented the impoverished Chinese and explained their predicament to Mr. Denman, a magistrate of the court. Reverend Piercy explained that the men had not immigrated to London to seek employment as launderers.⁷⁴ The men were employed on British merchant vessels as cooks, stewards, firemen and seamen. After hearing several

testimonies, the court decided that the Chinese legation in London should be responsible for resolving the predicament of these Chinamen.

In 1906, at the Immigration Board in Blackwall, the detention and fate of thirty-two Chinese "for want of means as undesirable aliens"⁷⁵ were discussed. They had arrived with only ten shillings between them claiming that they were employed as launderers in Liverpool. Mr. Hatterick, a missionary to the seamen at the Stranger's Rest, Liverpool, represented the men. He maintained that the Chinese were unaware who had paid their passage. As launderers he presumed that their employer would pay twenty-three shillings to twenty-five shillings per week. Kwong-Sing-tun, a Chinese grocer, asked to give evidence to the court. Kwong affirmed that one was his brother and the remaining eighteen were his cousins. They had come, he declared, to work, for him in his grocery and laundry business. He said that he paid his shop assistants eight shillings to ten shillings per week plus board and lodging, and laundry workers five shillings per week, including board. As they became more experienced, they would eventually earn fifteen shillings to even thirty shillings per week. He said that only two had any experience in the laundry trade and that he had hired the others as apprentices.

By December 1906, the Chief Constable in Birkenhead reported that fourteen laundries, with an average of four workers, existed in Birkenhead.⁷⁶ A report submitted by the Chief Constable in Liverpool showed that forty-nine laundries had been established in the city. Furthermore, he reported two English women working in the Chinese laundries.⁷⁷

In 1907, *The Daily Express* severely criticised the Home Office's management of the Alien Act (1905), as opening the doors to foreign nationals and critically jeopardising the jobs of their constituents.⁷⁸ The article stated that on 27 June 1907 a secret commission investigated the Chinese and reported that many lived close to Cleveland Square.⁷⁹ Furthermore, employment of Chinese was primarily in the management of boardinghouses, in laundries or as shop keepers. Two medical officers of health assigned to the Commission said that "the Chinese laundries compare favourably with the ordinary English laundries."⁸⁰

The South Wales Daily News reported that no fewer than twenty-five laundries were controlled by Chinese in Cardiff: "Canton has seven, Roath five, Cathy's three, Grangetown three, Splott two, Moors one, Riverside one, Penarth one, the remaining

two being in the central part of the city."⁸¹ In London, alone, twenty-five laundries were controlled by the Chinese by 1910. By 1911, 351 laundrymen resided in London.⁸²

Chinese laundry businesses did not seem to challenge the larger British laundries. British business centred on the hotels, private institutions and private families, while the Chinese catered to the poorer families, cleaning their shirts, collars, ties, and feminine attire.⁸³ The Chinese laundry was labour intensive, requiring more personnel to "dolly, roll, and rub," and labouring up to sixteen or more hours a day. They were thorough and clean. Sometimes customers criticised the damage done to their clothes.⁸⁴ By 1931, approximately 500 Chinese laundries were established throughout Britain.⁸⁵

Despite the negative reactions by some British, the Chinese launderers did not experience the same intense pressures as the seamen involved in the shipping industry. The laundry business gave the Chinese an occupation where they would not directly compete with the Seamen's Union or the general British society. The Chinese in Britain attempted to withdraw from any direct conflict or competition with their British hosts. In addition, no unified effort was mounted by trade unions to legislate against the Chinese in the laundry trade. As a result, the Chinese were free to pursue their occupations without much interference from the government or pressure groups. Consequently, Chinese laundries grew rapidly throughout Britain.

The laundry business eventually conceded to the development of the commercial washers for domestic use. In the Forties, the number of Chinese laundries decreased drastically⁸⁶. Many laundries closed. Ultimately, the laundry trade became obsolete and gave way to the more lucrative restaurant industry for the new immigrants from China.

Employment in the Restaurant Industry

The establishment of the first Chinese restaurant is unknown. Some seamen learned their cooking skills while onboard the ships. The Company provided the provision for them. On shore, seamen continued to prepare and consume their ethnic foods while living in the boarding houses. They catered to the tastes of the seaman who were temporarily awaiting ships, and the permanent Chinese community.⁸⁷

During the early developmental stages of the Chinese restaurant, Europeans

found most ethnic foods strange and unpalatable. They were seldom seen patronising the restaurants since they favoured their own foods and were unwilling to change their dietary habits. For a few Chinese the restaurant industry provided a livelihood, finances to maintain themselves and family, and a place to congregate with other members of the Chinese community.

In 1913, a writer described one restaurant belonging to Mr. Chong Chu. He said that the restaurant generally served food according to local Chinese tastes. However, if forewarned, he could prepare food for the taste of European visitors.⁸⁸ The menu consisted of Chinese mushrooms, sharks' fins, sea slugs, and savoury messes of chicken and young bamboo shoots. The place was scrupulously clean, and the kitchen was the "cleanest part of the establishment."⁸⁹ In addition, the customers were asked not to spit or rinse their mouths with tea upon the floor, and they were politely notified that "guests bring their own manners."⁹⁰

Only a few Chinese opened restaurants in the port cities of Britain. According to J. Watson, the number of restaurants was small.⁹¹ Before 1940, approximately thirty to forty restaurants were established. After 1945, one-hundred restaurants were in existence.⁹² It was after 1960 that the restaurant industry expanded, as a new wave of immigrants from Hong Kong arrived in Britain.

Employment in the British Merchant Services

Due of the War (1939-1945), approximately ten thousand Chinese served in the British Merchant Service.⁹³ The relationship between the British and the National Government of the Republic of China strengthened as the British required more Chinese seamen to work in their merchant services. The recruited Chinese seamen came from China, Hong Kong, Singapore and Trinidad.⁹⁴ Officially signed pacts known as the Anglo-Chinese Agreements (1942 and 1944) created a seaman's pool in the United Kingdom, and clearly specified the conditional employment of Chinese seamen.⁹⁵

The Liverpool office coordinated the pool. The objective of the pool was to meet the manning requirements of shipowners and to provide continuing employment of Chinese seamen who gave loyal service to the government.⁹⁶ They would work either on the Holt Line or for the Anglo Saxon Company. These agreements defined the following areas: basic wages, war risk money, contract period and bonus, service after expiry of a contract, leave, overtime, back wages, etc.⁹⁷

Both the Chinese and British governments agreed to these arrangements. Every effort was made to keep it operative. In the articles written on the 18th and 19th of January 1945, the *Chinese Nationalist Daily* printed a comparative table illustrating the disparity in conditions.⁹⁸ These allowances were much lower than those assigned for British seamen. The report claimed that the Chinese seamen received about eight pounds basic wages, ten pounds war risk bonus and no pocket money while ashore. Sailors and firemen received thirteen shillings per hour. Stewards received nothing for overtime work. Also, each seaman received fifteen pounds for compensation of loss of effects and an allocation of one hundred pounds death benefit. They also received compensation of a few pounds for injury.⁹⁹

Inequities also extended to food rationing and accommodations. The report explained that a comparison between British and Chinese seamen was practical. The Chinese received the following provisions: one pound of fish and meat per day, no chicken, duck, cake, eggs, ham, fresh fruit or vegetables (only cabbage and potatoes), one tin of milk in four weeks, and a poor quality of sugar, rice and fats.¹⁰⁰ They were not provided mattresses, blankets, sheets, towels, toilet paper, and eating utensils except one piece of household soap once a month.¹⁰¹ Finally, if a Chinese seaman was ill, he was required to work when he was fit. He received a small allowance to buy a few cigarettes and no liquor.

In response to these allegations, the British government issued an explanation for each charge. They contended that while the basic pay for British seamen was fourteen pounds per month, the Chinese employed by the Anglo-Saxon Company received eight pounds seventeen schillings. The Holt Company paid them seven pounds seventeen schillings per month. War risk money was equivalent in both cases to ten pounds per month. British seamen, in overseas pools, received two pounds six shillings.¹⁰²

In summary, throughout this period other employment opportunities developed for the Chinese as launderers, boarding house keepers, restaurant owners, etc. As seamen, employment depended on the circumstances of the British government. During both World Wars, the Chinese were hired by the British onboard their vessels. They also worked in the munitions and aerodrome industries.

Boarding houses provided employment and shelter as well as a place where the Chinese could maintain his culture. It provided a place of sanctuary, and contained them from the influences of the British society. In fact, the boarding house became a

social gathering place. In the boarding house, cultural and traditional activities and networks of informal relationships could be established with other Chinese. This situation allowed them to remain within the confinement of their ethnic group, and to develop primary relationships among themselves.

The Chinese were also involved in the laundry industry. It was labour intensive and did not require much skill. Its long hours isolated them from the general society. As a result, relationships were ethnically enclosed and structural assimilation did not occur.

Little information was known about the early restaurant industry. Only a few existed. Nevertheless, the restaurant trade provided employment, and protected the Chinese from the influence of the cultural behaviour of the British. Since they were not directly competing with the British, they were left alone. As a result, structural assimilation did not occur.

Finally, spatial mobility was limited. From the evidence gathered, most of the Chinese did not own property. In London, the Chinese community lived in Limehouse and Pennyfields. The small community remained unified until the end of the Second World War, when they had to leave the area because of reconstruction. In essence, the initial Chinese community living in the Borough of Tower Hamlets remained enclosed, and movement into the broader British society did not happen until the end of World War II.

Chapter V will evaluate the responses of the shipowners, Sailors' and Firemen's Union, the British Government and the Chinese community towards assimilation during 1900-1950. How the attitude of various sectors of the British community influenced the Chinese will be discussed. It challenged them to either maintain their ethnic traditions or acquiesce to the cultural values of the British.

CHAPTER V

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: 1900-1950

THE RESPONSE OF THE BRITISH AND CHINESE

Chapter IV addressed structural assimilation as it related to settlement and employment [1900-1950]. This Chapter will elaborate on the specific responses of the British and Chinese decision-making groups during these same years. The British society--the government, shipowners, seamen's union and the general British populace--was affected by a growing Chinese community. The Chinese community, comprised largely of seamen, reacted according to their perception of the problem. In reality, the solution to the problem of assimilation existed in the attitudes of both the British and Chinese populations. Important to this study was the examination of how their relationship intertwined with each other.¹ The analysis examines the attitudes and intentions of each group, especially in the way their actions or reactions impeded or enhanced structural assimilation.

THE RESPONSE OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT

While the Chinese community developed in the dock lands, the British government passed stringent laws to curtail the immigration of more foreign nationals. These laws focussed on all ethnic minorities. Nevertheless, they had a major impact on the Chinese.

Aliens Acts

In response to Jews immigration between 1880-1905, the Aliens Act of 1905 was passed to control their movement into Britain. This Act empowered immigration officers to refuse entry to any alien unable to support himself and his dependents, or was likely to become a burden on the State.² It was intended to reduce social costs of alien immigration.³

In 1914, the Aliens Restriction Act was introduced, as a temporary measure, to regulate immigration. It limited Chinese immigrants to Great Britain by restricting the number of alien passengers, on any given ship, to twenty.⁴ The Ocean Steamship Companies were the only companies that carried Chinese passengers.⁵ Sometimes

shipping companies were reprimanded by the Home Office for their failure to comply with the Act. Five years later, the Aliens Restriction Act (1919) repealed the Aliens Act (1905).⁶ Under the Expiring Laws and Continuance Acts, both the 1914 and 1919 Acts⁷ had to be renewed annually. The Aliens Restriction (Seamen) Order, issued on 28 July 1915, amended the Alien Restriction (Consolidation) Order (1914) requiring an alien to possess a picture identification passport not older than two years.⁸ An alien was prohibited from landing, unless given temporary permission, by an Alien's Officer.⁹ The Act required vessels that remained in any port for a period longer than twenty-four hours, to comply with the requirements of Article 1.¹⁰

Another aspect of the Act limited employment if a seaman could not prove that he had served at least three years "before the mast" or in the capacity of a seaman. It also regulated food rations. All cooks were required by the Board of Trade to hold a certificate granted from a school of cookery.¹¹ Mr. J. Cotters of the National Union of Cooks and Stewards, stated that 50 percent of the men who had taken cookery classes at the various ports, were Chinese.¹²

The Liberal Party criticised these policies. A report on the status of immigration, issued by them, blamed the cause of Britain's immigration problems on the passage of the British Nationality Act (1948). They insisted that these problems were created when Commonwealth immigration, particularly with the independence of India, signalled the end of Britain's colonial role, and established a category of British subjects.¹³ Individuals of these countries were granted a right to free entry into Great Britain and were considered "British Subjects" and Commonwealth citizens.

Regulating Alien Identification

Before the beginning of World War I (1914), no procedure to register aliens existed. It was The Defence of the Realm Act (1918) that first required alien registration.¹⁴ The purpose of the Order was twofold: first, to provide a register of seamen; and secondly, to ensure exempted seamen were not abused by men taking unduly long periods of shore leave between voyages.¹⁵ It was later amended to conform to wartime conditions. In its amended format, the law stipulated that every seaman, before employment on a British vessel, had an identity and service certificate.

Most of these aliens were seamen who lived in the seaport towns. The local police were responsible for registering the seamen. By the end of 1922 the

Metropolitan Police District registered a total of 3159 Chinese--2640 men and 519 women. In 1924, they registered 1403 alien Chinese--1157 men and 246 women. By the end of December 1924, the Central Registry recorded 1697 aliens in London--1447 males and 250 women--484 more than recorded in 1922.¹⁶

In time, the registration of immigrants became more complex. A seaman, occasionally, produced documents made out in as many as four different names claiming each was equivalent to the other.¹⁷ The Secretary of the State requested that the name be spelled exactly as it appeared on the Consular Certificate or passport possessed by the alien. Other names would be regarded as aliases unless it was suspected that the document belonged to another person.¹⁸

Certificates usually recorded the applicant's photograph, an imprint of his right thumb, and a detailed description of the person.¹⁹ The document could be corrected to correspond to the Consular Certificate or passport.²⁰ In 1934, to ease this problem, the Foreign Office sent a letter to the Chinese legation requesting that when passports were issued the name be listed by the underlined surname, with its foreign renderings.²¹

Lodging House Acts

The Common Lodging House Act (1851) required the registration of all common lodging houses in London with the Metropolitan Police. In 1894, the local Government Board transferred the registration powers of the police to the London County Council. Later, the registers, kept by the police from 1851 to 1894, were also transferred. Under section 214, an order could permit duly licensed people to operate a seaman's lodging house. Up to that time, no order had required any person keeping a seaman's lodging house to obtain a license.²²

Local authorities were given authorisation to regulate all lodging houses. Licensing had originally been optional. In 1909 the government initiated the Merchant Shipping Act (1894) and the Compulsory Licensing of Boarding Houses. The latter, which became effective in 1910, curbed the establishment of unlicensed boarding houses.²³ The new legislation empowered the local authority to pass bylaws relating to seamen's lodging houses in their district and to make those laws binding on all persons keeping houses lodging seamen, even the owners and persons employed.²⁴

With the passage of the new licensing law in London, seamen's boarding houses had to be licensed annually. Owners were required to comply with the strict regulations

under the law. When the law became effective in 1910, the number of lodging houses decreased sharply from thirty to thirteen. The new regulations clearly described the penalty of "noncompliance."²⁵ In addition, it gave the Council under the Article the right to have an officer of the Board of Trade or police inspect, day or night, any lodging house. It did not however, deter the continued establishment of unlicensed boarding houses.

Other regulations within the Licensing of Boarding House Laws, stipulated the maximum number of lodgers who could be accommodated. It determined room specifications, ventilation requirements, and cleaning and sanitary procedures.

After 1900, the Act became an obstacle for the Chinese entering the boarding house business. Occasionally, the boarding house keeper was summoned to court after violating these regulations. In one instance, the Thames Police Court charged a Pow Sang of keeping a seaman's lodging house without a license. A witness found several men sleeping at the defendant's quarters. He stated that the men had come from Glasgow too late in the day to be boarded at the Asiatic Home. A few days later, five additional seamen were discovered at 46 Pennyfields. Eventually Pow Sang was fined 5 pounds plus costs.²⁶

The Thames Police Court summoned Sin Song for keeping a Chinese seaman's lodging house without a license.²⁷ In 1920 another boarding house keeper was charged for keeping a disorderly house. He was recommended for deportation and fined 5 pounds plus two guineas for court costs.²⁸

The Merchant Shipping Act (1894) only affected seamen's boarding houses in London. The problem extended far beyond the actual boarding house licenses. It included such things as sanitary and health conditions, and the use of houses as opium dens and gambling places. In June 1907, the Liverpool City Council appointed a select commission to investigate the Chinese in their city. This group conducted their inquiry and concluded that the sanitary conditions of the lodging houses kept by the Chinese, were clean and well conducted.²⁹

The House of Commons

In March 1908, the House of Commons discussed the subject of Chinese labour on British ships. A select committee was formed to investigate whether the Merchant Shipping Act (1906) could be carried out to help the Board of Trade prevent Chinese

employment in the British Mercantile Marine.³⁰ They were to decide whether foreign subjects were unfairly employed under the terms and conditions excluding and depriving British-born subjects of their rightful employment.³¹

Pressured by local constituencies, the government became more involved in Chinese affairs. Often they were misinformed about the Chinese population and their activities. In one instance, they accused the Chinese of trying to evade the restrictions of the Aliens Act (1905). Mr. Houston (Liverpool, West Toxteth, Opp.) requested that the Home Secretary provide information involving Chinese aliens and Chinese women living in Liverpool, especially about a group of 755 Chinese, who were assumed to have entered the country illegally.³²

Mr. Winston Churchill responded to Mr. Houston's query. The Liverpool police informed him that 755 seamen had not been passengers seeking employment in the United Kingdom. They explained that more than 755 seamen had been engaged for outward voyages and had deserted or been paid-off. Churchill further reported in the *Daily Debates* on 12 April 1911 that besides seamen, 142 steerage passengers had arrived in 1909 and another ninety-seven in 1910.³³

Doubts remained despite Churchill's attempt to resolve the matter. The Marine Department carried out their own investigation and resolved the matter in a report submitted to the Home Office. They stated that during 11 April 1910 through 31 March 1911, one hundred and eighty-four British ships in Merseyside had engaged Chinese seamen. The total number on board had been 4,683 and 212 had deserted. Five-hundred forty-three had been paid-off in Liverpool, leaving 755 Chinese seamen, who had either deserted or been paid-off.³⁴

Mr. Hudson Kearly, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, told the House of Commons in March 1908 about another group of 448 Chinese who had signed articles in the ports of the United Kingdom in 1905. In 1907, the figure had leaped to 1,211.³⁵ Churchill and the National Union of Seamen were alarmed by the unexpected increase.³⁶

The Home Office

The Home Office Commission, comprising the Liverpool Watch Committee and representatives of the police and magistrates, made a report in the *Daily Express* on 17 April 1907. They said that Chinamen had monopolized the Liverpool laundry trade and

eliminated many British workers from that profession.³⁷ They stated that the Chinese knew little of the trade before arriving in the country, and that they had learned it from poor British laundry women.³⁸ The report explained that the Chinese had gambling dens, "unspeakable" sanitary conditions in their community, and that their sexual advances enticed young English girls. Some English wives were interviewed. They stated that they were treated with more generosity and kindness than their working class peers, who had married English labourers.³⁹

In January 1910, the Home Office sent a letter to the Alfred Holt Ocean Steamship Company. It stated that twenty-seven-Chinese immigrants, enlisted as laundrymen or grocers, had been refused permission to land.⁴⁰ Three years later, the Master of the *S. S. Tydeus* informed the Home Office that the cargo ships of the Ocean Steamship company were careful not to exceed twenty Chinese passengers.⁴¹ Due to varying circumstances, verification by immigration officers was not always accurate.⁴² The Home Office threatened the private companies that their numbers of steerage passengers would be decreased if they did not comply with their wishes.⁴³ Finally, on 19 April 1911, the Secretary of State, issued the following proclamation.

And whereas I deem it expedient to make an Order fixing a number other than the said number twenty as regards any ship from Hong Kong or Chinese ports owned or controlled by the Ocean Steam Ship Company Limited of Liverpool which brings alien steerage passengers to be landed in the United Kingdom at the port of Liverpool. Now, I hereby fix as from the twenty-fourth day of this month until further order, the number of alien steerage passengers at two, as regards any such ship.⁴⁴

In June 1921, an anonymous letter was sent to the Home Office. The writer accused the Chief Constable of accepting fifty pounds for an Identity Book.⁴⁵ He stated that more than 300 Chinamen had been smuggled into the United Kingdom by Chinese seamen and were now living in the laundries of Liverpool, Birkenhead and Manchester.⁴⁶

The Birkenhead Chief Constable investigated the allegations concerning the increase of Chinese in the laundry business. He reported that the proprietors were carrying on a legitimate business and that no evidence of smuggling, especially on the Blue Funnel Boats owned by Holt and Company had occurred.⁴⁷

Two months later, the police became suspicious of three Chinese who frequently travelled between London and France. Way Soo Ho (34), Wong Hing (35), and Wong Wah were grocers who worked for Quong Sing Company in Liverpool.⁴⁸ On 26 August 1921, the Chief Constable in Newport proved the suspicions of the Liverpool Central Police. The Home Office was informed that "a well-organised conspiracy" existed for the smuggling of Chinese, and that "special attention should be paid to all Chinese holders of registration certificates issued during the present year."⁴⁹

The Air Ministry

After the Armistice in 1918, several hundred Chinese seamen were dismissed as carpenters, labourers and cooks on the aerodromes at Hambel and Bicester. By January 1919, all of the Chinese seamen had been discharged by the Air Ministry and returned to London and Liverpool.⁵⁰ Approximately 742 Chinese seamen had been employed in the aerodrome industry.

The Alien and Nationality Committee met on 28 March 1919, and raised two questions: (a) the future policy concerning the Chinese seamen, and (b) the disposition of the Chinese seamen under consideration.⁵¹ They decided to repatriate all discharged seamen who had been employed in the war work.⁵²

On 30 May 1919 the Committee asked the Ministry of Shipping to provide a ship, to transport two thousand Chinese seamen to China.⁵³ It was decided that the Chinese should receive no financial payment for their resettlement in China.⁵⁴ The seamen refused to leave Britain because they owed large sums of money to the boarding house keepers.⁵⁵ Later, the Committee changed their mind. Upon embarkation, they recommended that five pounds should be paid to each man and that the lodging house keepers should be allowed on board the ships to collect the monies owed them by the seamen.⁵⁶

The Chinese Seamen's Union was not entirely in favour of the plan. They would cooperate if the seamen were allowed to work their passage back to China. In fact, the union doubted the seamen would accept the offer of free transportation (3rd Class Passage) at the expense of the Ministry of Labour. They insisted that the seamen would rather work their passage as ordinary seamen enabling them to pay their debts to the boarding house keepers.⁵⁷ The union also stated that the seamen would not be prepared to go voluntarily under any circumstances.⁵⁸

Four boarding house keepers housed the Chinese seamen. They were also recruiters for the various shipping companies. During the seamen's unemployment, they extended credit to the seamen for lodging and food. The seamen owed money--between 500 and 2000 pounds,⁵⁹ and were advised to decline any offers of repatriation until they had repaid their loans.⁶⁰

In London, Liverpool and Cardiff, the Ministry of Shipping asked the police to help with the repatriation of the seamen. The Cardiff police arrested and deported 53 Chinese seamen on the *S. S. Atreus*, on 6 June 1919, from Birkenhead.⁶¹ On 26 June 1919, the Liverpool police identified another 1,442 Chinamen. Of this number 172 were permanent residents (53 married to English women), and 1,270 were unemployed seamen waiting for employment.⁶² Unfortunately, they were only able to record forty or fifty names. By 19 July 1919, the police had persuaded only one man, a Fuk Liao, to leave on the *S. S. Laomedian*.⁶³

The Chinese Legation in London suggested that a commercial boycott be waged against the British if the Chinese seamen were forcibly deported.⁶⁴ They offered three proposals to resolve the problem: first, to allow the men to work their way as far as India, then find their own way back to China, leaving the Lascars to work the ships back to Britain; second, to assign the men to work in either France or Belgium under the authority of the War Office; and third, employ the men in agricultural work within Great Britain.⁶⁵ Responding to the Chinese Legation's proposal, the Home Office pointed out that the first and second options were not possible.⁶⁶ Finally, the government declined to make any allocations to the seamen.⁶⁷

Nevertheless, on 2 July 1919, the Labour Emergency Expenditure Committee proposed that the Chinese Minister would disburse the allowance. The amount approved by the Treasury was seven pounds per man for their voyage and resettlement. Each seaman would understand that he would obtain a receipt for the allowance from the Committee.⁶⁸ In spite of this financial agreement, the Chinese Minister was still concerned that the boarding house keepers would refuse to free the men.

While arrangements were being made, the police in Liverpool were informed that the Ministry of Shipping had promised to provide a ship in early September. It became impossible to repatriate any sizeable number of Chinese seamen because of the need to convey troops to India and the Far East.⁶⁹ The earliest the Ministry of Shipping could provide a ship was in the new year (1920). With this delay, an additional

concern was raised that a larger subsidy for the seamen would be required. The proposed seven-pound allowance would be insufficient to pay for the supplementary board and lodging expenses for the next five or six months.⁷⁰

Police in London and Liverpool continued to search for volunteers to return to China. It was still the intention of the Ministry of Shipping to repatriate eleven hundred unemployed Chinese seamen--three hundred from London and the remaining eight hundred from Liverpool. Logistically, the Liverpool police felt that arresting and detaining the several hundred men a few days before the departure of the ship was impossible. Meanwhile, the London police reported that they felt it was doubtful whether they could arrest 300 men without inciting a riot in Limehouse.⁷¹

The Treasury informed the Home Office that they opposed giving an additional three pounds or three pounds ten shillings to the seven pounds for each Chinese seaman. Due to the difficulties of securing a ship, the insufficient numbers of volunteers for the voyage, and the impossibility of detaining several hundred Chinese, the Ministry of Labour maintained that they were not too concerned about the matter.⁷²

On 19 September 1919, after several weeks of negotiations, the Alien and Nationality Committee felt that it was not the right time to undertake the repatriation of the Chinese seamen. Inducing anyone to return to China was impossible. Wholesale deportation was determined impractical by the police in London and Liverpool.⁷³

The Board of Trade

The Merchant Shipping Act (1906) attempted to control the number of foreign seamen working on British vessels by requiring seamen to speak English. A notification was issued by the Board of Trade to all foreign seamen regarding the new requirement.⁷⁴ The seamen were urged to apply with the superintendent of a mercantile marine office or to a British Consul for the necessary test.⁷⁵

No special forms were prepared to find out the seamen's competence in English.⁷⁶ Each superintendent was required to examine each man to learn whether he had sufficient knowledge of the English language.⁷⁷ The Seamen's Union expressed their opinion that the purpose of the requirement was not only for the protection of the British labourers, but as a matter of safety. They believed that understanding the orders given to the foreign seamen in emergencies, were a necessity.⁷⁸ Mr. H. Wilson, the President of the Firemen's and Seamen's Union, to underscore the importance of

English language, described a situation where the leading seamen, knowing little English, was asked to interpret a long legal document and could not.⁷⁹ Despite the intention of the Act, the Board's failure to administer it effectively became a source of bitter resentment and discontentment between the Union, the shipowners, and the Chinese.

British subjects were exempt from the language tests. To control the employment of seamen who were not British subjects, the Board of Trade required that they provide evidence of their nationality or discharge books at the time of signing-on.⁸⁰ Despite these efforts to administer the language test or require proof of nationality, the Chinese often avoided it by merely stating that they were from Hong Kong or Singapore. One incident in January 1908, showed several seamen who could not pass the test. They claimed that they were dependents of Hong Kong but could not produce any proof to prove their claim.⁸¹ *The Seaman* reported that if a Chinese seaman was rejected by one official, he would approach another and claim that he was from Hong Kong.⁸²

The Seamen continued to challenge the issue of Chinese labour and their inability to pass the language test. They were not amused by the evasive attitude of the Chinese or the shipowners. They accused the shipowners of excluding the natives of India or other British ports from taking the language test, suggesting that it was a good measure of the owners' "patriotism."⁸³ Mr. J. Havelock Wilson criticised the Chinese who could speak English and signed-on. Only later to be replaced by another seaman, who did not understand English at all.⁸⁴ He vowed that when the Chinese were tested on their knowledge of English, or even British citizenship, he would test them personally on the former point.⁸⁵

The instigation of the language test was aimed at closing the boarding houses. Unfortunately, the boarding house enterprise was "too profitable to go under to a mere test."⁸⁶ In a letter to the Home Office from the Board of Trade, the Board reported that the Union was actively antagonising the Chinese. They were "invoking every statute and registration they could against them," and accusing the Chinese seamen and boarding house keepers of disobeying the Alien Restriction Order.⁸⁷

Before the Act, the Chinese claimed residence in various parts of China.⁸⁸ In 1907, the reports showed 590 Chinese, 190 of whom claimed to be from Hong Kong or Singapore shipped from Poplar. One year later in 1908, out of 192 shipped in that

year from Poplar, 162 or 94 percent declared that Hong Kong or Singapore was their place of origin.⁸⁹ In fact, *The Seaman* reported that if the authorities had consulted previous shipping records, it would clearly prove that the Chinese, "with impunity" deceived the Board of Trade.⁹⁰

By June 1905, Winston Churchill (M. P.), was the President of the Board of Trade.⁹¹ On 12 June 1908, he met with thirty British seamen and told them he was sympathetic to the general wish of the Union to have stricter control over those British sailors who failed to join their ships. Churchill expressed his concern about the increase of Chinese labour⁹² and told them that he would not allow an increase of Chinese seamen in the United Kingdom.⁹³ He felt that the Chinese, like the Germans, Russians, and French, should be required to take the language test. He disagreed with the policy that they could merely show that they were British subjects, without having to provide any evidence to prove that point.

Immediately after the meeting with these seamen, Mr. Churchill issued the following instruction to superintendents and mercantile marine officers concerning the application of the language test:

The superintendent is informed that Chinese or other Oriental seamen should not be allowed to sign the articles of any British ship whose crew is being engaged before him, unless they can pass the language test . . . or unless they can prove to his satisfaction that they are British subjects or inhabitants of a British protectorate, and consequently exempt from the test.

The Board of Trade are in communication with the Colonial Office on the question whether any facilities exist or can be provided to enable natives of British Colonies (more particularly Hong-Kong and the Straits Settlement) and inhabitants of British protectorates, to obtain an official document showing their place of birth.

The instructions do not apply to Lascars who . . . are exempt from the language tests . . . unless he has been shipped under a Lascar agreement made by virtue of Section 125 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, and approved by the Government of India.⁹⁴

Shortly after the new directive was issued to the superintendents, Churchill received information concerning the number of Chinese residents in Liverpool. The

report estimated that 286 men and three women lived in Liverpool, while Birkenhead had approximately 63 residents.⁹⁵ Churchill concluded that the language tests, administered by the Board of Trade, had a considerable effect in reducing the number of Chinese serving on the merchant ships.⁹⁶

Sir Walter Howell of the Board of Trade sent a letter to the National Seamen's and Firemen's Union regarding his concern about the language test and its impact on them if the Chinese were unable to pass it. He stated that the enactment of the Merchant Shipping Act (1906) would leave the Chinese destitute in the United Kingdom because of the seamen's inability to pass the test, or to prove they were exempt of the regulation.⁹⁷ Beginning 7 July 1908 and for three months, the Board decided to resolve the matter by allowing the Oriental seamen, who could not comply with the new regulation, to sail to Singapore, or places eastward of that port.⁹⁸

The conflict between the British and Chinese seamen was not only confined to verbal attacks. Violence erupted in 1908 and 1911 against the Chinese who attempted to sign on at the Board of Trade offices at the East India Docks.⁹⁹ British seamen were agitated because they could not receive higher wages, due to, as they perceived, the willingness of the Chinese to accept lower wages. Further confrontation occurred during the 1911 seamen's strike in South Wales. Other foreigners supported the strike while the Chinese seamen continued to work. After several weeks, the frustration and anger extended to the attack of thirty or so of Cardiff's Chinese laundries.¹⁰⁰

With the outbreak of war, the question of cheap Chinese labour continued to be an issue. Since 30,000 to 40,000 British seamen were unemployed, the union felt that they should be given priority over the foreign seamen. Problems of the rate of pay, the language test, and Chinese who could not produce the required certificates, were difficult obstacles to resolve for the union and the government. These problems continued to be unsettled.

The City Council

City Councils were also concerned about the effect the Chinese had on their community. In a special meeting convened by the Liverpool City Council, the Council requested evidence regarding the moral and economic effects of the

increased importation of Chinese.¹⁰¹ They were informed that approximately 70 Chinese laundries, and, as one member of the Council stated, "were used as a cover for immorality."¹⁰² Alderman Maxwell, Chair of the Watch Committee stated that the Chinese, compared to other foreign aliens, gave the police little trouble and such an investigation would be of no significance. He was outvoted, and the resolution passed forty votes to six.¹⁰³

In July 1907, a Commission appointed by the Council issued their final report concerning the Chinese living in their community. During twenty meetings, forty witnesses gave evidence. It was recommended that the regulations under the Aliens Act (1905) should be strengthened from time to time, so that the Chinese would abide by the Act.¹⁰⁴ The Commission further suggested that due to the relations of the Chinese with white women, the Home Office should amend the Criminal Law Amendment Act. They felt that it would protect girls between the ages of 13-16. They requested that the Health Committee investigate the habits and mode of living of the Chinese in lodging houses and laundries.¹⁰⁵

The Private Shipping Companies

The shipping companies supported the Chinese and other foreign seamen. Their representative in the House of Commons Lobby, opposed other Members of Parliament who supported the reduction of Chinese labour. He viewed the agitation against the Chinese as an undercurrent of politics.¹⁰⁶ He also felt that the Merchant Shipping Act had restricted the employment of Chinese seamen on British ships. These restrictions had made it almost impossible for a shipowner to discriminate or distinguish between English-speaking Chinese seamen, British Chinese and other Chinese.¹⁰⁷ He explained that the Chinese were not taking the jobs of British seamen, but simply filling positions vacated by other foreigners.¹⁰⁸

Alfred Holt & Company (The Blue Funnel Line), P & O, Clan Line, Ellerman and Bucknall, Gow Harrison, the Ben Line, Raeburn & Verel, and Arthur A. Rapp continued to employ foreign labour on their vessels.¹⁰⁹ The union reported that the Alfred Holt & Company, whose headquarters were in Birkenhead, dispensed with approximately 1,000 white British born, family supporting seamen, and replaced them with Chinamen whose pay was below National Maritime Board rates.¹¹⁰

The British shipowners questioned countless reports recorded and printed in *The Seamen*.¹¹¹ Shipowners continuing to employ the Chinese, created a deeper rift between them and the British seamen. The union attempted to deter any efforts by the shipowners and Chinese to secure employment on British vessels. However, they were adamant that the employment of Lascars or Chinese was purely economic and not racially based.¹¹² Unable to restrain the Shipping Federation from using Asiatic labour, the union's actions became more violent.

The British Seamen's and Firemen's Union

As trade expanded with Asia and the Far East, the West penetrated China to exploit its resources. Through various treaties previously discussed in Chapter Three, the British seized the opportunity to expand their economic dominance in China. Other foreign seamen and the Chinese, received lower wages and required fewer provisions than British seamen. Besides, the supply of British seamen, in these areas, was insufficient to meet the demands of trade. *The Daily Chronicle*, underscored the British seamen's concern about cheap labour. It repeated the steady increase in the number of Chinese who secured berths in Cardiff and received wages comparatively lower than Europeans, and that the Chinese seamen required only a cheap, though wholesome, diet much less than the British seamen.¹¹³

The British were also unwilling to encourage the Chinese into their social structure. This attitude restricted any possible intimate and primary relationships and confined the Chinese to establish these ties in their own community. The Seamen's and Firemen's Union was, perhaps, the most vocal and aggressive in their attempt to neutralise the effects of Chinese labour in the shipping industry. From their constant struggle, they secured the aid of politicians, and regularly stressed the problem in their official publication--*The Seamen*.

Mr. Havelock Wilson, the President of the Union, informed the readers of *The Reynolds Newspaper* that colonies of Chinamen were springing up in most British ports. Mr. Wilson believed they were primarily recruited to supplant "Britons" in a British industry.¹¹⁴ The *Cardiff Maritime Review* echoed the same sentiments.¹¹⁵ Another report stated that the British seamen received 4 pounds 10s a month. The shipowner, through the Shipping Federation paid, 3 pounds 5s, 3 pounds 10s, and 3 pounds 15s per month to the Chinese.¹¹⁶ After 1914, the British

seamen's wages steadily increased until 1918, they received, depending on their jobs, more than 150 percent increase in their wages.

Another accusation, directed against the use of cheap Asiatic labour, focussed on the Workmen's Compensation Act (1906) which the Union believed would increase Chinese labour. If a seaman was killed, compensation would be given to his relatives. Nevertheless, the shipping company would keep the money of a Chinese seaman because "Ah-Sin's relatives in the Far East would know nothing of the death of the seafarer, and were too far off to claim their due."¹¹⁷ As a result, the Act affected the European seamen who were leaving the British Mercantile Marine. This was extremely undesirable for the government.¹¹⁸

The Union sent a telegram to Mr. Herbert Samuel (MP) attesting that 1,000 Chinese seamen were living in boarding houses in the East End of London registered under the Aliens Registration Act. They questioned the government about whether the boarding houses were licensed by the London County Council. According to the Union, 70 boarding houses in London catered to the Chinese and only six were officially licensed.¹¹⁹ In Liverpool, 4,000 Chinese seamen lived in accommodations that "no English boardinghouse keeper or lodging-house keeper would be allowed to keep people in for a moment."¹²⁰

They continued to be concerned when they heard of approximately 10,000 aliens, in Poplar, registered at the Town Hall.¹²¹ Chinese proprietors, and other British boarding house keepers were regularly investigated by the authorities, and the police continually raided their premises to suppress and abolish gambling and the use of opium. It was notoriously reputed that boarding houses were used by seamen for smoking opium and for gambling. Before the establishment of the Defence of the Realm Act (1916) the authorities were powerless to convict people who were illegally using cocaine or opium. Opium smoking was openly practised in the Chinese lodging house. One report stated that, Wilson had visited a boarding house and seen men cramped into rooms, gambling and smoking opium pipes.¹²² In the small rooms of the lodging houses, as many as twenty or even thirty men would gather to play Fan Tan (poker). Large sums of money exchanged hands during the games. In 1916, Mr. J. Cotter of the Ships' Stewards Union complained that four thousand Chinese seamen in Liverpool lived in boarding houses that were unfit. Upon entering a house, he found forty Chinamen gambling and others in a state of

comatose as the result of opium smoking.¹²³

On 23 May 1916, New Scotland Yard reported physical violence between two-hundred local residents. It involved Irish and Chinese seamen on the High Street in Poplar and Pennyfields. It was caused by the "Chinese encroaching upon the Irish colony, and offering and paying higher rents. Another cause was because they willingly worked for fewer wages than British seamen on the boats."¹²⁴ The police arrested eight people, including five Chinese seamen. Two or three weeks after this incident, on 31 May and 9 June, two outdoor meetings were held at Pigott Street, Limehouse. Wilson, Captain Tupper and members of the Union gathered to protest the "invasion of Chinese in Poplar and Limehouse."¹²⁵ Members of the Salvation Army reported that the protest had been designed by those who wanted to escape military service.¹²⁶

During World War I, additional pressure was applied to the government by the union. In a letter addressed to "His majesty King George V," on 23 May 1916, the union expressed disgust against the British shipowners who employed Chinese while British Seamen were available.¹²⁷ The union recommended that the Board of Trade enforce the laws and regulations regarding the employment of alien labour in the Mercantile Marine.¹²⁸ It was not until the end of the War, that the government attempted to rectify, or at least satisfactorily address the problem.

The union was powerless in excluding the Chinese even if they had not passed the language tests. In Cardiff 1400 unemployed British seamen petitioned the government to take the necessary steps to repatriate all Chinese seamen. They demanded that the Admiralty fulfill its agreement made on 3 November 1915 to employ only British or British coloured seamen.¹²⁹ Fifty Chinese were brought from Cardiff to Birkenhead. They refused to comply with the orders of the authority to be repatriated. Finally, they succumbed to the pressures of the government and returned to China.¹³⁰ By 1920, the number of unemployed British seamen had risen to 20,000, and in Liverpool alone estimates showed 2,000 out-of-work sailors.¹³¹

World War I did not lessen the tension and animosity towards the Chinese seamen. During that time, the number of Chinese seamen employed by the British shipowners increased against the vehement protest of the union. As a result, the union enlisted the aid of other unions, such as the Transport Federation and Cooks

and Stewards Unions. "Captain" Tupper, after inspecting 457 articles of the respective shipping company of ships sailing since August 1914, reported to the General President of the Seamen's Union. He stated that on 29 vessels, 620 Chinese were sailing as part of the crew.¹³² This averaged more than 21 per vessel. In spite of the pressures by the union, it was felt by some that the employment of Chinese during the war, should continue.¹³³

As late as 1933, the question of the language test still existed. The unions were concerned by this time, not only with Chinese labour, but Lascars, "Kroo Boys," Arabs and other foreign seamen, who were all cheaper to maintain than their British counterparts. The union attributed the 50,000 unemployed British seamen to the continued use of alien labour.¹³⁴ They continued to blame the shipowner for this situation.

In summary, British attitudes did not support structural assimilation. The British Firemen's and Seamen's Union did not want the Chinese employed on British vessels. Chinese employment threatened their economic security. Negativism, prejudice and discrimination followed the Chinese because they were willing to work for lower wages. Legislative laws and the attitude of elected government officials supported the feelings of the British seaman. All these factors affected structural assimilation through employment, spatial mobility and in developing primary relationships with the British.

THE CHINESE RESPONSE

The Chinese reacted negatively to the resentment they received from their British hosts. Customarily, the Chinese seaman tried to use their limited shore-time to pacify their longing for women, drink, and other vices, which included gambling and smoking opium. These activities, centred in the dock lands and boarding houses, fuelled the anti-Chinese sentiment of the British.¹³⁵

The Ratcliff Highway was notorious for its "riots debaucheries, robberies, and all conceivable deeds of darkness."¹³⁶ Frequently men were drugged, and sometimes half-murdered falling prey to the inhabitants of the area.¹³⁷ Once, just before the close of a public-house, a few Chinese had been drinking beer with some women when a dispute took place.

The foreigners alleged that they had been robbed. This

was indignantly denied by the women. Some Englishmen came forward and had their say in the matter. In the end, a serious disturbance occurred. Finding that the affair was becoming one of blows as well as words, the Chinamen ranged themselves in a body, drew their knives from their pockets, and, shouting "Amok, amok!" They fought their way into the room and rushed upon all they met, stabbing and cutting men, women and children indiscriminately. The knives of these people are peculiarly adapted from ripping flesh, and thus the wounds inflicted were for the most part a serious nature.¹³⁸

Such incidents did not go unnoticed, nor were they condoned by the public and government.

The Chinese Seamen's Union

The Chinese felt compelled to defend themselves from the adversity engendered by the different segments of the British society. By 1907, to combat this discrimination and protect themselves, the Chinese organised and established mutual societies.¹³⁹ The establishment of these societies was anchored in their cultural practices, religious beliefs, and mutual associations. These societies protected the members from the abuses of a prejudiced society, helped in the adjudication of quarrels, provided financial assistance and aided with travel expenses for those seeking to return to China, and performed burial rites.¹⁴⁰

A Chinese Seamen's Association (*Tung Yee Tong*) was founded in London in 1908.¹⁴¹ It had very little power or voice in the National Union. On 16 September 1916, their letter, printed in the *Liverpool Courier*, refuted the published number of Chinese in Liverpool as one thousand, rather than four thousand.¹⁴² It also stated that though the boarding houses were very old, they were well kept, scrupulously clean and sanitary.¹⁴³ Concluding, they stated that opium smoking was not their fault, and accused the British of developing the trade in Asia.

Who first forced opium into our country against our wish and made us poor as a nation, yet we do not complain we only want the truth and the truth is opium smoking is initially stopped as our critics ought to know, both in Liverpool, Cardiff and everywhere else, and Chinese have bid farewell to the habit. Therefore how can they longer smuggle an article which they

cannot purchase?¹⁴⁴

In summary, the Chinese chose to retain their cultural identity. They were proud of their heritage, and continued to hold on to their language, customs and traditions, and established mutual societies to preserve their cultural identity. As a result, they voluntarily isolated themselves from the general British society. This solution was not without its complications. A small number married British women and raised children. They did not expect their wife or children to be Chinese.

Chapter VI will examine marital assimilation and its implications on families. It will also discuss the extent to which primary relationships were developed and whether large-scale intermarriages occurred.

CHAPTER VI

MARITAL ASSIMILATION: 1900-1950

INTRODUCTION

Marital assimilation has a direct correlation with structural assimilation. The primary emphasis of this chapter will be the research of marriage records at St. Catherine's House in London. This information will be examined to track the growth and practice of intermarriages occurring in Britain during 1900-1950, between Chinese men and British women. The chapter will also focus on the attitudes of the British towards such intermarriages.

THE BRITISH VIEWPOINT

British resentment towards the Chinese and other minorities, stemmed largely from the activities of seamen who came ashore to satisfy their appetites for sex, gambling, opium smoking, and other vices. Reputed as a place that enticed those seeking the pleasures of gambling, prostitution and other social evils, the Limehouse district became the hub of the seamen's onshore activities.

These activities were met with mixed reactions. A Reverend George Mitchell, whose declared mission was to save the "heathens" for Christ, had overtones of racism.¹ He stated that intermarriage of Chinese with English women had produced many "half-cast mites with Oriental eyes and English feet."² For a few city officials, the sexual contact of Chinese men with British women was a concern. Others, like the council in Liverpool, felt that it was not their prerogative to comment on the desirability, or otherwise, of these relationships.³ The Liverpool Trades Council in 1906 protested against the increase of Chinese; the *Daily Telegraph* accused the Immigration Board of "dumping" thirty penurious Chinese in Liverpool.⁴

A Liverpool Chief Constable, in a letter to the Home Office, echoed his personal objections concerning the half-cast population.⁵ Another report stated that the influx of Chinese seamen would create a colony of Chinese half-breeds in places like London, Liverpool, Cardiff because the Chinese sailors were intermarrying with English women.⁶

Growing anxieties towards coloured seamen alienated the British community,

who believed intermarriages or relationships between white and coloured races was repulsive.⁷ Countless stories, true or fabricated, were repeated to incite the anger of both the public, and the politicians.

British Women

British women, associating with, and marrying the Chinese, were characterised as having degraded themselves.⁸ Most of the women were less than twenty years of age, and followed the Chinese from Glasgow, Cardiff, South Shields, Liverpool, Manchester and Birmingham.⁹ These women probably met the men in the munitions factories, aeroplane manufacturing, or other jobs during the war.¹⁰ Horace Thorogood, in *East of Oldgate*, felt that the women who associated with the Chinese were not local women, because local women had strong prejudice towards mixed marriages.¹¹

White English women seem to exercise a remarkable fascination for them. But the white women who fall into the clutches of the 'yellows' are not Londoners, but mainly come from provincial inland towns. They are without exception young and pretty, but in what manner they are attracted to the Chinese quarter of London has not been unravelled. There seems to be a systematic policy on the part of the Celestials not to take to themselves women or girls of the neighbourhood.¹²

The *Evening News* reported that the worst part of the vice between British women and the Chinese, was their association with the Chinese.¹³ The women were described as "selling themselves" and in spite of some being "recused," others had become entrapped in moral decadence.¹⁴ Eventually, the resentment and anxieties caused the Poplar Borough Council to request that the Home Office apply stronger measures to control the situation.¹⁵ These accusations and slanderous remarks of the press alarmed several residents of Limehouse, Pennyfields.

One report stated that a particular social class of young women, from good homes, associated with the Chinese. It claimed that these women had fallen into prostitution.¹⁶ A Detective Inspector in the Limehouse Division explained however, in the Chinamen's defence, that the Chinese would not leave a woman to prostitution, but preferred to marry instead.¹⁷

As viewed by one Chinese resident, the facts were very simple. The causes

of the problem were the English women who lived in the West End, and frequented the area.¹⁸ If they kept away, the problem would cease. In fact, the Limehouse area attracted many women, particularly "with broken reputation[s]."¹⁹ Another report stated that the problem of having white women in Limehouse was not caused by those Chinese who had married English women but was because of the eligible Chinese and coloured men who lived in there.²⁰

Mr. Cairns, a Thames Magistrate, also felt that the white population was largely to blame for the problems in Limehouse but was baffled why British women would "commit moral and physical suicide."²¹ British women who lived with a Chinese had money to spend, smart clothes to wear, new and fashionable shoes.²² They were not "hypnotised" but went willing to the Chinese. The Chinese and other coloured seamen were unable to resist "the blandishments of pretty young girls as are their white brethren."²³

In Pennyfields, one report stated that young women from the age of fourteen were seen entering the Chinese boardinghouse, up to two and three in the morning. The Chinese were not entirely to blame and some observers stated that the blame of the association between English women and Chinese was on the former, who flaunted their attention on them.²⁴

Another report stated that they, "have no difficulty in getting English women to marry them, to cohabit with them, or to act the prostitute with them, and in these relations they treat their women well; they are sober, they do not beat their wives and they pay liberally for prostitution."²⁵

Most of the local British women who associated with Chinese seamen came from the working class. Those who associated with or intermarried were well treated. Their Chinese husbands provided adequate incomes. In one instance, as reported by one writer, the money was used to purchase clothes and fashionable shoes.²⁶

One woman expressed her feelings and declared her working class status by stating:

They like you to look flash and to go and 'ave baths and all. So long as you don't shame their face you're all right. What I mean is: if you take up with a Hongkong man, you mustn't make friends with a chap from Shanghai, or you're for it.²⁷

The press described the women as spoiled. They reported that the women sunbathed most of the day, leaving their husbands to scrub and cook the meals, without any protest from them.²⁸

Some women were daughters of dockworkers.²⁹ In one instance, the father of one young woman, who was less than thirteen, was prosecuted for allowing her to associate with a Chinaman.³⁰ An Irish woman in her twenties, was charged by a Magistrates Court for her illicit activities with a Chinese man. She was described as "having sunk within two or three years to the lowest depths of degradation" and urged to return to Ireland.³¹ Her reply to the request was "If my mother knew what I had become she would kill me."³²

Relatives and close friends at times alienated the British women who married Chinese men.³³ These women claimed that they would be ridiculed and even stared at disapprovingly, when seen out with their husbands.³⁴ Derogatory and uncomplimentary remarks would be made. This uncomfortable circumstance forced the couples to seldom be seen together in public, limiting their social life to Chinese gatherings.³⁵

Marriages

From all reports, the Chinese men who married local British women, were extremely decent and respectful of their wives.³⁶ Their wives were expected to care for the children and to be responsible for the domestic duties of the home.³⁷ The men were conscientious fathers and husbands, frequently cooking, washing-up, and caring for the children. One woman who married a Chinese stated, "I have never known a days uneasiness . . . he has been an ideal husband to me, and he worships his children . . . [and] I love him more now that I did when I married him."³⁸ Such statements were not isolated but characterised the sentiments of most, if not all, marriages between the Chinese men and English women. When questioned by a newspaper reporter, one woman stated that her home life was just that of an ordinary English home.³⁹

Some people have got an idea that we live in a place something like a heathen temple with bells and incense about and a carved sword or two on the walls. The place is, as you see, just an ordinary English working man's home with English furniture and piano. My

husband eats his own food during the week, mostly but on Sundays we sit down to the good old-fashioned English meals.⁴⁰

M. Broady's study of the Chinese community in Liverpool found that, according to English wives, their husbands were jealous.⁴¹ English wives suggested that they missed the companionship that they would receive from an English husband. Their Chinese husbands were not affectionate and did not express any affection for them while they were in public.⁴² The wives complained that they were not taken out and their husbands went alone to clubs, cafes, etc. Affection was never displayed in public and at one couple's wedding anniversary, "it was the wife's sister, and not the husband who took them out to celebrate."⁴³

The Evening News reported that mixed-marriages brought tragedy upon their offspring. Boys could not find work while the young women drifted in the streets and often ridiculed by white women their own age.⁴⁴ An English woman who married a Chinese explained that prejudices were often directed against them. In fact, things were so bad that mothers would not take their children out because people would laugh and point at their children. Yet, these half-caste children were well fed and were as good as most, and better than many, of the children.⁴⁵

Communication in English had been a weakness in the relationship. One English woman regularly spoke with her husband in very simple English words.⁴⁶ The same man was brought before a Magistrate's Court. He declared through an interpreter that he could not read English. He could only write his name in English, which he had been taught to do by his English wife.⁴⁷ This situation was generally the rule, rather than the exception. English proficiency, especially spoken English, for the majority, was not much higher than the man mentioned previously.⁴⁸ Mothers spoke English, while the father's English was limited. Their conversations were mixed English and Chinese. The children understood only a few phrases of the dialect.

THE CHINESE VIEWPOINT

Few Chinese women lived in Britain. The Chief Constable of Birkenhead reported that no Chinese women were living there in 1906.⁴⁹ However, according to K. C. Ng, forty-nine China-born females lived in England and Wales in 1901,

representing 12.6 percent of the number of resident Chinese.⁵⁰ In 1906, only one Chinese woman lived in Liverpool, while fifteen English women married Chinese men.⁵¹ Population statistics do not show whether these Chinese women were married or single. The opportunity however, for an endogamous marriage for the Chinese men was practically nonexistent. As a result, men wanting to marry had three choices: marry British women, remain unmarried, or return to China to find a wife.

Sex Ratio of China-Born Aliens in London					
Table 16					
Year	Males	Females	Year	Males	Females
1861	59	19	1911	220	27
1871	51	43	1921	627	84
1881	100	9	1931	729	465
1891	176	126	1941	No Census	No Census
1901	97	23	1951	687 (344 Hong Kong)	663 (242 Hong Kong)
			1961	1314 (1017 Hong Kong)	1470 (1039 Hong Kong)

Kwee Choo Ng, *The Chinese in London*, Institute of Race Relations, (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 8.

As the Chinese seafaring community grew, intermarriage became inevitable. Eventually, a handful of Chinese seamen married local British women, and raised families in their new country. Of the 224 permanent residents in Limehouse, only fifteen, or 7 percent married local British women.

INTERMARRIAGE RESEARCH

As a major part of this paper, original research concerning marriages was conducted at St. Catherine's House in London. Extensive records of births, marriages and deaths for England and Wales, beginning in 1847, are retained in this building. Information was gathered to find out the number of intermarriages that occurred between the British and Chinese.⁵² More than one thousand volumes were consulted to extract the names of Chinese living in England and Wales. Their surnames were searched alphabetically. The names of the Chinese were randomly extracted, then analysed to determined statistically the extent to which intermarriages occurred. The statistics reflect those found in the marriage registry. A dearth of statistical data on mixed marriages exists. Other resources and

materials are unavailable to substantiate exactly, the number of intermarriages between the Chinese and British.

The next step was to find the surname of the individual in the marriage records from 1900 onwards. The marriage records or certificates provided the following information: the name of the parents, listing the family name of the wife.

Some difficulties arose in determining whether the surname was Chinese since British or English surnames are similarly spelled. These spellings would include names such as Ching, Tam, Fat, Young, Lee, etc. or other derivatives of foreign nationals living in Britain. In such instances, these names were not included in the list unless the first given name was also Chinese.

Intermarriages before 1912

Another difficulty, although not severely critical to the study, limited the use of marriage records before 1912. Marriage entries list the name of the person alphabetically, the surname of the spouse, location and the reference number by which a marriage certificate could be ordered. Before 1911 the marriage records show the name of only one spouse. Both names of the husband and wife were needed to decide whether they were married to each other. As a result, a Chinese name may appear in the listing, but without reference to his wife's name, intermarriage could not be proved. A child, identified as Chinese by his surname, could only be identified as the offspring of a mixed-marriage. For example in 1910, only seven Chinese marriages were recorded.

Through random sampling it was determined that in 1911, seventeen Chinese men married. It can be assumed that most of these men were married to British women, but this cannot be verified without knowing the name of the spouse. Only in one instance was the mixed-marriage of a couple, before 1912, substantiated by a newspaper article.⁵³

Additionally, if the original marriage documents were available for this research, it would have established the following information: (a) the full-name of the spouse; (b) the ages of the couple; (c) date of marriage; (d) condition (a bachelor or spinster); (e) occupation; (f) residence at the time of marriage; (g) father's name and surname; (g) residence at the time of marriage; (h) profession of the father; (I) parish; and (j) witnesses.⁵⁴

Intermarriages: 1912-1950

In the survey of marriages of Chinese between the years 1913-1950⁵⁵, a total of eight endogamous marriages took place while one hundred and nineteen intermarriages occurred. Comparing the periods of 1913-1920 and 1921-1930, the statistics showed an increase in endogamous marriages. This suggested that more Chinese women were available for marriage in Britain.

Number of Chinese Marriages in Britain: 1913-1950 Table 17					
Year	Mixed	%	Endogamous	%	Total
1913-1920	119	94%	8	6%	127
1921-1930	231	86%	39	14%	270
1931-1940	218	75%	73	25%	291
1941-1950	581	77%	173	13%	754

Alan M. Uyehara, *Research Statistics: Marriage Registers at St. Catherine’s House*, 1986.

Most of the intermarriages occurred before 1950 between the early Chinese seamen and local British women. The seamen coming on shore were conditionally required to remain in Britain for short periods, usually one month. The shipping companies were responsible for their maintenance and ensured their departure from the country. By marrying a British woman, a seaman could extend his stay indefinitely, subject to the Secretary of State's conditions. The regulations were administered by the Home Office. It is uncertain how many seamen were put in this position. Unquestionably, marriages under these circumstances were possible.

Early records available on the Chinese community, particularly those describing the marriages of the Chinese seamen, showed that a small fraction of these men married British women. Clearly, from available records and statistical reports of marriages conducted in Britain, more than 84 percent of Chinese marriages involved British women.⁵⁶

The Survey of Intermarriages in Poplar, Stepney and Limehouse

The research revealed that of the forty-six parents or guardians of children attending schools in Poplar, twenty-five Chinese men were found in the marriage registers. Each had married a British woman. This represents 54 percent of forty-six, clearly suggesting that most fathers were Chinese.

Analysing the marriages geographically, a total of 170 mixed marriages occurred in the Poplar, Limehouse and Stepney areas between 1912-1950.⁵⁷ Ninety-eight were presumably first generation Chinese since their Chinese given names was used to register their marriages to women who were not Chinese.⁵⁸ The remaining sixty-two were registered by their Christian given name indicating that they were second generation children.

A Survey of Chinese Marriages: Poplar/Stepney/Limehouse (1912-1950) Table 18		
Type of Marriage	Number	%
Mixed Marriages	98	58
Mixed Marriages (Christian Names)	62	42
Total	170	100
Endogamous Marriages	23	56
Chinese (Christian Names)	17	44
Total	40	100

Alan M. Uyehara, *Research Statistics: Marriage Registers at St. Catherine’s House*, 1986.

Since most of these children were the offspring of mixed marriages, further intermarriages would affect the physical characteristics of the second and third generations. In addition, second generation Chinese, sixty-two of seventy-nine individuals intermarried. This suggests that their offspring, or the third generation, were assimilated into the British society.

Surveys of Liverpool Intermarriages

Chinese marriages in Liverpool from 1912 to 1950 show that 579 mixed marriages took place, as compared with 245 endogamous marriages.⁵⁹ Of the 579 marriages, 152 had Christian given names. They represent the number of second generation Chinese who had also intermarried. However, of the 247 Christian-named marriages, 61.5 percent of the individuals preferred mixed marriages. The total number of marriages for this forty-eight-year period (1912-1950) was 824 or 70 percent mixed marriages.

A Survey of Chinese Marriages: Liverpool (1912-1950)		
Table 19		
Type of Marriage	Number	%
Mixed Marriages	427	74
Mixed Marriages (Christian Names)	152	26
Total	579	100
Endogamous Marriages		
Chinese (Christian Names)	150	61
Total	95	39
	245	100

Alan M. Uyehara, *Research Statistics: Marriage Registers at St. Catherine’s House*, 1986.

SECOND GENERATION IN LIMEHOUSE

Children were born to intermarried couples. The second generation entered the predominant British society through the educational system. They were influenced initially by their British mothers, who spoke English as their primary language. This section will explore the population of mixed-children and the extent to which they were assimilated as British.

Another aspect of the research was to decide how many children were enroled in the London County Council Schools--Gill Street and Dingle Lane-- who were offsprings of mixed-marriages, and their choice of marriage partners. The research procedure focussed on the children who attended the London County Council schools.⁶⁰ A brief survey of the children living in Limehouse was initiated through the London County School records that came from the schools they attended. Most of the children came from mixed-marriages, and each had an Anglicised Christian name and Chinese surname. Most, if not all, these children were evidently given an Anglo-Christian name, probably because of the influence of their British mother.

In the County School records in Limehouse, approximately twenty-five children were the offsprings of mixed-marriages.⁶¹ This number represents 56 percent of the total number of Chinese-surnamed children, suggesting that many families lived within the catchment area of that particular school. It is unclear whether children of endogamous marriages were given Anglicised or Christian given names. Therefore, identifying whether the child came from a mixed-marriage

was essential. This could only be proved from the marriage record.

In the initial survey, eighty-two pupils with Chinese surnames were listed in several school Registries. They attended schools in Stepney or Poplar between 1906-1945. Forty different sets of parents or guardians were also recorded. The records show eight children born before 1912 whose ethnic background or nationality could not be determined because of insufficient information. Of the eight children, six had Christian names. Three children born in 1913 came from parents married in 1913 or before 1912. Twenty-six parents, of the total forty-six parents or guardians, whose children attended the London Council Schools, were found in the marriage registers at St. Catherine's House. Forty-seven children of the total eighty-two, or 57 percent, were from mixed marriages.⁶²

The second generation Chinese children born in this country, (the majority from mixed marriages), assimilated into the British culture through subsequent intermarriages. These children, who spoke English as their first language, and schooled in a British system, viewed themselves as British. Traditional and educational values and social expectations were instilled in them. They were British!

Marriages of the Second Generation

During World War II, the Greater London region suffered devastating bombardment. As a result, the children of this area were evacuated, sometimes to the countryside. Sometimes, they were sent as far away as Canada. Some never returned home. Others suffered physical injuries and even death--natural, or because of the War.

The research into these children revealed that of the eighty-two children, only thirty-three could be found in the marriage registers, or 41 percent of the total number of children.⁶³ In one instance, only two children of a family of eight children were married in Britain. However, in another family with five children, all were married in this country.

The records show that thirty-three children from mixed marriages, married in Britain. It revealed that twenty-eight intermarried with the British population. One or two were married to members of other ethnic groups. Two married Chinese, while two children of mixed-parentage married each other. Intermarriages

for the twenty-eight children represent 85 percent of the number of the mixed-second generation children. Only 15 percent married Chinese.⁶⁴

The marriage statistics of children with Chinese surnames and Christian given names showed that 77 percent of these individuals intermarried. This suggests that most children of mixed parentage are likely to marry non-Chinese. Consequently, their offspring's physical characteristics would be less Chinese in appearance. This also implies that their marriages are more dependent on primary relationships, emphasising similar interests and general background, i.e., class, economic position, education, etc. than racial extraction. Children of such marriages are less likely to suffer prejudice and discrimination. Their offspring develop a strong sense of "peoplehood" based exclusively on the British society.

In summary, structural assimilation did not affect marital assimilation. The previous chapter suggests that primary relationship with the British was negligible. It appears that the British women developed their relationships with the Chinese near the dock lands. Relationships, initiated by these women, found the Chinese more supportive than British men. Furthermore, British women who associated with, and married the Chinese, suffered animosities and discrimination from their families and peers. Although a few Chinese intermarried, large-scale intermarriage did not occur, suggesting that the Chinese were not structurally assimilated into the British society. The research also shows that the increase in Chinese partners encouraged endogamous marriages. The children from these marriages received mixed-reactions from the British. Physically, they were identified as Chinese, and often felt discriminated against by their British peers. In the years that followed, these children intermarried with the British, and their children eventually lost their Chinese features.

Chapter VII will focus on a new period for this study: 1951-1985, concentrating on their cultural assimilation through education. The 1951-1985 period brought a new wave of immigrants from China, mainly from Hong Kong, that far exceeded the pre-1950 generation.

CHAPTER VII
EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: 1951-1985
BACKGROUND

As evidenced in previous chapters, assimilation was a complex process. Acknowledging the various problems and circumstances, this chapter will focus on educational and cultural factors that influenced Chinese immigrants, especially the children, entering postwar Britain. The following indicators will evaluate the cultural assimilation of the Chinese: entrance into the educational system, English language acquisition, and the acceptance of the cultural traditions and values of the British society. An investigation will also be made of the British and Chinese viewpoints that influence the process of cultural assimilation.

Language of the Immigrant Children

British schools faced many challenges in assimilating foreign students, particularly in English language instruction. For example, the first language of 104,000 pupils was not English. ILEA’s records show 44,925 foreign students speaking 131 languages.¹

Inner London Educational Authority Main Language Groups: 1981 ²			
Table 20			
Language	%	Language	%
Bengali	12.0	Italian	6.3
Turkish	9.8	Urdu	6.2
Greek	8.6	Chinese	5.0
Spanish	7.6	French	4.7
Gejerati	7.5	Arabic	4.1
Punjabi	6.4	Portuguese	4.1
		Other	17.4

ILEA, 16.

Five thousand three hundred and ninety-one pupils speak Bengali, the largest language group. Chinese pupils represent 5 percent of the foreign language speakers or 2,246 pupils. English was not the first language for 27,007 primary aged children. Of this number, 17,905 were enroled in secondary schools.³ In the primary schools,

18,059 were not fluent in English and in the secondary schools 5,869 had similar language disabilities.⁴ Many Chinese pupils in the school system cannot speak English. As compared to 65 percent of other foreign speaking students in ILEA administered secondary schools, only 52 percent of the Chinese pupils seem fluent in English.⁵

Chinese Children Population

Before 1950, the population of Chinese children was not large enough to be a problem for local educational administrators. Most children in that era came from mixed-marriages and assimilated into the British society. After 1960 however, the Chinese student-aged population mushroomed, becoming a concern to the local educational authorities.

Today Chinese children represent the third largest minority group in the United Kingdom.⁶ These children come from different backgrounds.⁷ They emigrated from Hong Kong and other countries (Southeast Asia, Europe, West Indies, etc.). Seventy percent speak *Cantonese*, 20 percent *Hakka*, and 5 percent *Mandarin*.⁸ Even where there was a concentration of Chinese however, but the group represents only 5 percent of the school population in any given area or authority.⁹

In the 1970's, it was estimated that 1,600 Chinese children emigrated into Britain annually.¹⁰ The Hong Kong High Commission reported between 2,000 and 3,500 immigrants a year.¹¹ Since 1973, with changes in British immigration policies, the children's population has expanded. During that year, three-thousand children arrived, mainly from Hong Kong.¹² By the Eighties, an estimated 30,000 Chinese pupils lived in the United Kingdom.¹³ According to the 1981 Census, 120,123 individuals were from the Far East Commonwealth. Of this number, 39,742 (33 percent) were born in the United Kingdom and 80,381 (67 percent) in other countries.¹⁴ The majority born in the United Kingdom (9,717) live in Greater London.¹⁵

Approximately 25,000 children (83 percent) live within the area of the Inner London Educational Authority district (ILEA).¹⁶ The breakdown of children in schools in the area was 2,800 pupils--1,600 in primary schools, 1,100 in secondary schools and 50 in primary and special schools.¹⁷

ILEA estimates that half the number of Chinese children in their schools were concentrated in the Boroughs of Westminster, Islington, and Camden.¹⁸ They make up half the enrolment in one school near Gerrard Street.¹⁹ In 1982, four hundred fifty

Chinese school children were enroled in Strathclyde--74 in a nursery, 249 in primary and 127 in secondary schools.²⁰ The Home Office estimated 24,000 children of 91,000 Chinese were born in Britain.²¹

THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

In 1983, the British government formed a special Home Affairs Committee. Three reasons were offered by the Committee why Chinese children had difficulty with their education. First, the Chinese community was scattered throughout the country. The nature of the take-away shops makes it unfeasible economically to congregate in one area.²² With so few Chinese children in most schools, unlike the Asian and Afro-Caribbean, they seem invisible.²³ Second, because of the general opinion that the children were quiet, polite and hardworking, who arouse little antagonism, they were usually ignored by the educational authorities.²⁴ In addition, statistical information was unavailable because the local authorities do not keep statistics of different ethnic groups within the authority.²⁵ Only a few cities had any sizeable concentration of Chinese. They make very few demands on the British system. As a result, educators believe they were working with a small minority with temporary and insoluble problems which will eventually dissipates.

Some second language teachers had not yet been trained to deal with the cultural difference of the Chinese.²⁶ Since the programme was new few, bilingual teachers in the ILEA were involved with minority groups. Few schools provide special catchup programmes for these pupils.²⁷ In South Glamorgan, the County Council has established crash courses in English for children with severe language difficulties.²⁸ Their purpose was to give the children the skills to integrate, at some early stage, with the rest of the class.

The children were described as "reticent, diligent, academically motivated pupils."²⁹

"You hardly know they're there"; "They are awfully well restrained. It's like another experience having to teach Chinese." But his sort of acquiescence provokes downright hostility in other teachers: "I don't like these impassive faces staring back at me"; "Sometimes I want to shake them and yell them to protest, react and do something dangerous for a change, but they never do. They look at you as if they're judging you."

I've only two in my class: if I had a whole roomful,
I'd go mad."³⁰

Outweighing these problems, however, was the teacher's ignorance of the children's social and cultural background, and their linguistic difficulties.

The government stressed that English acquisition should be the priority for children whose mother tongue was not English and therefore lack language skills. Training was needed to help them compete on equal terms with their contemporaries in school, and subsequently to give them the opportunity of participating fully in British adult life.³¹ They encouraged local education authorities to examine their language provision and methods of identifying those needing assistance.

Challenges of the Second Generation: English Language

The problems facing the second generation pupils were diverse. English acquisition remains the constant problem in the primary and secondary schools. If pupils cannot do well in English, only a few will enter higher education, even if they do well in other academic subjects.

One report stated that children born in Britain, though speaking English like their English peers, were underachievers in school.³² These children entering school with little knowledge of English were often unable to catchup with their peer group. While the Chinese pupils were struggling to learn English, their peers were learning new ideas. By the time they had mastered spoken English, they had fallen behind in reading, writing, and conceptual development. In one case, a young boy whose parents had lived in Britain for seventeen years, could speak only one or two words of English.³³

Evidence suggests that most of the second generation Chinese born in the 1970's, had lost their mother tongue.³⁴ Children born in Britain had very few problems in communicating with classmates. They speak, in the words of a headmaster, "no more Chinese than Liverpoolians speak Welsh."³⁵ As more children were born in the United Kingdom, they will need less help in English since the succeeding generations will speak English as their first language.

Some pupils were discouraged when they fail to obtain an English O-level or C.S.E. Eventually, they leave school to seek employment within their own community. Those who leave school usually regret their decision.³⁶ Chinese children

who remain longer in school, often does much better than other ethnic minorities in public examinations.³⁷ A sample from the Swan Report shows that many Chinese students receive five or more O-levels, or equivalent grades as compared with other minority groups.³⁸ In Liverpool, only a handful of Chinese students at the university or the polytechnic was British-born.³⁹

The selection of an occupation was a challenge faced by the children. Few options were available for those who were unable to speak, or use the English language. It limits their access to skill-building courses, vocational training and language classes offered by the local educational authorities, making it almost impossible for them to secure employment outside the Chinese community. Chinese youths emigrating to Britain in their teens, particularly those who leave school without any skills or language proficiency, cannot compete in the job market.⁴⁰ Work in the catering industry was for the majority their only source of employment.

Discrimination

English children often hinder the assimilation of the Chinese children. They show their discrimination towards Chinese children and other ethnic minorities through their reactions and remarks. Typically, the Chinese children receive verbal abuse, intimidation and physical bullying.⁴¹

At school, the children were hampered by their deficiency in English. Their problems were compounded by discrimination from their peers, and the apathy of their teachers who do not fully appreciate, or acknowledge their learning difficulties. The children need time to adjust to a new environment and do not need the extra burden of discrimination. Many problems they encounter at school dissuade them from continuing. In extreme cases, they openly seek sought physical revenge against their peers.

Ping Ling-ho is 16. One day in February he took a knife to school. It had a small sharp blade and he kept it in his shirt sleeve. He knew who it was for. By the end of the day, he had stuck it in the English boy's heart. Ping Ling-ho spent five months in prison cells, waiting for his trial, attending the court hearing. He was accused of murder. After a long trial he was acquitted--the killing was self-defence. He had been bullied and intimidated for a whole year. He just could not stand it anymore.⁴²

THE PROBLEMS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

The preceding section, regarding the entrance of the Chinese pupil into the educational system, has clearly shown that English was the most formidable and often the most bewildering of problems faced by the Chinese. Cultural assimilation was dependent on their ability to use the English language, and cannot be ignored as indispensable towards assimilation. It not only affects the children but all aspects of the Chinese community. The problem was more noticeable as the population of the Chinese grows and becomes visible.

While the struggle for cultural identity and preservation continues within the family unit, researchers view the situation from a different perspective. Some, like D. Jones, claim that the Chinese were not interested in assimilation. Many do not bother learning English.⁴³ They retain their ability to pass almost unnoticed in the wider community.

Broady feels that the Chinese had not been forced to assimilate, particularly they had not been encouraged "to adopt nor impelled to admire patterns of behaviour that was radically incompatible to his own."⁴⁴ Broady continues by stating, "Even if he marries an English woman he does not mix widely in English society. If he acquires any of the memories, sentiments and attitudes of English culture, it was only superficially. Nor does he deliberately attempt to organise his life enough to prevent or to reduce conflict with the local society."⁴⁵

However, English acquisition extends to all age groups including older children entering the British system.⁴⁶ An estimated 75 percent of the adult Chinese immigrants speak no English and were unlikely to learn it.⁴⁷ The Mid-Glamorgan County Council estimates that 70 percent of the first generation immigrants speak little English.⁴⁸ The lack of confidence in the usage of the English language curtails their participation in their local societies. Integration was virtually nonexistent.⁴⁹

According to the government's analysis these problems consist of three fundamental obstacles. First, English deficiencies--the Chinese cannot read, write or speak English. Second, they were ignorant of various British agencies. They do not know how to use the socialised system. Third, they were reluctant to ask for help because of their attitude of self-reliance.⁵⁰ The inability of the Chinese to use English leads to further social problems: (a) isolation of women and the elderly; (b) underutilisation of the social welfare system and (c) self-reliance.⁵¹

Isolation of Chinese Women and the Elderly

Chinese women were a major concern. These women, who come as young brides to marry men in the food business, were socially isolated and do not learn the language. They become dependent on their husbands and only mix minimally with their own community, and suffer from depression.⁵² Hindered by their inability to express themselves freely, they soon feel trapped, isolated and lonely.⁵³ They spend long hours at home preparing food and caring for young children. Many Chinese women become emotionally unstable, quarrel with their spouses, beat their children and complain of psychosomatic problems.⁵⁴ These problems were now becoming more evident, especially because of the unsociable hours that the Chinese husbands work in the restaurants.⁵⁵

The Chinese women were isolated not only from the host society, but also within their own group. Sometimes, mothers were unable to speak with their own children who had become more integrated into the community.⁵⁶ Chinese mothers usually like to supervise their children's homework, but they cannot because they do not understand English.

When the children were at school and husband was at work, they were usually home alone. They do not mix with the neighbours. Most were not Chinese. The women busy themselves with household duties. They were never really satisfied. These women also depend on their husbands for finances, a situation that can often lead to arguments, or serious marital breaches.⁵⁷

Problems extend and affect the family unit as well. One report suggests that some elderly parents, who were uneducated and do not speak English were "worse off than their peers in the host community."⁵⁸ The elderly men who live alone were afraid of sudden death. Elderly women living with their children feel abused and battered.⁵⁹ They accompanied their children to Britain to take care of their grand children. Initially, this arrangement worked out well. Soon grandmother or grandfather got older and did not have the energy to cope with active young children. Members of the family ostracized them because they were useless to them. The elderly Chinese became frustrated and depressed.⁶⁰

Under-Utilisation of the Social System

Like other immigrants, the Chinese were typically unaware of the British

institutional framework and structure. This situation was coupled with their suspicion of public officials. Their ignorance of the system severely restrains them from using the agencies and services legally available to them. Invariably, they receive little compensation, or assistance, for their needs from the government. This predicament was wholly due to the language barriers and their lack of knowledge of the bureaucratic system. Their own irregularly long hours of work ⁶¹ aggravates the problem. Other ethnic groups more vociferous in their demands, will have their needs resolved by the government.

Health was another issue. The Chinese community's health problems were influenced by three factors: (a) communication difficulties that affect both the communicating of symptoms, and the difficulty of understand instructions from a non-Chinese speaking doctor; (b) the Chinese idea of health and disease based on a traditional upbringing; and (c) the misunderstanding of Western medicine and distrust of Western doctors.⁶²

Many Chinese were not registered with a general practitioner. They find it difficult to express their symptoms to a doctor. Therefore, the diagnosis was not specific. Prescriptions were made on those basis, resulting in further consultations and complaints by the patient.⁶³ A Chinese man went to see his local doctor accompanied by his university-educated son. His son spoke fluent Chinese but had difficulty explaining the difficulties of his father, who complained of dizziness and diarrhoea. The doctor treated the father according to the son's explanation and sent him home. When a Chinese doctor reexamined the father, his diagnosis showed that the illness was far more serious than originally diagnosed. When this information was told to his own doctor, the father received an urgent appointment. Eventually, the hospital admitted the father where the appropriate treatment was administered.⁶⁴ In another situation, it was reported that a young Chinese boy, who was asthmatic, was taken by his father to the surgery for treatment. When he arrived, the surgery was closed. He was unable to read the notice on the door that stated where the doctor could be reached after surgery hours. Instead, the father travelled several miles to a friend, who arranged for the boy to be seen by another doctor.⁶⁵

Social problems extend into the home as well. The children were usually employed in the family's take-away or restaurant business, working unusually long hours, segregated from their peers. The children find their parents strict. One girl

said, "I can't go out at night. I can only go to the library in the afternoon. The English seem to have more freedom. Which was better? I don't know."⁶⁶ Two cultures were pulling at the children, causing frustration, confusion, and anxieties. Psychological problems for young adults were increasing due to the opposition from their older immigrant parents, who insist that they were safeguarding traditional culture and values.⁶⁷

Self-reliance

The ethnic characteristic of "silence" and their inability to pressure government agencies had worked against them. They were stereotyped as "self-reliant." Therefore they receive little assistance from the local, or national government, who think that the community can resolve its own problems.

Problems were viewed differently by various factions of the Chinese community. First, the conservative group believes the problems of the community should be resolved through their own efforts--"to wash one's dirty linen in public would be too much a disgrace."⁶⁸ Telling outsiders family problems was believed to be shameful.⁶⁹ Seeking outside help was considered absolutely disgraceful.⁷⁰ Dependence on one's own abilities was fundamental. If difficulties arise, the immediate family was consulted, and if necessary, distant relatives or friends. Consequently, the Chinese were reluctant and apprehensive to request assistance from outside authorities.⁷¹ The second group believes they should assimilate and integrate into the British society. They should try to use the resources available to them, if not for themselves, for their children and future generations.⁷²

CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: THE BRITISH RESPONSE

The British had made little progress in resolving the problems of the Chinese because of three reasons. First, they lack accurate demographic data on the Chinese community. Second, they were unable to talk effectively--orally or through written communication--with the Chinese without specialist Chinese speaking staff. Third, they were ignorant of the cultural diversity within the Chinese community.⁷³ The following section will address the actions of the local authorities to provide English training to the Chinese and the support of mother-tongue education.

English Acquisition: The Local Educational Authority

In Britain each education authority was autonomous and responsible for the implementation of the government's recommendations. Newcastle has an estimated 1,000 Chinese people living in the City.⁷⁴ In school, fifteen children needed extra assistance with English. They attended the Education Authority's Primary Language Unit. Another fifty-one Chinese children attended the Secondary Language Unit.⁷⁵ In most areas, the Chinese population was dispersed. This was not so in Merseyside. The Chinese were the second largest ethnic minority in the area but the educational provisions afforded them were inadequate. In the Language Centre no teachers specifically trained to teach English were employed.⁷⁶

The Torphichen Language Unit and Services, in the Lothian region, had provided language instruction for primary and secondary school children who had language difficulties. A head teacher refers pupils lacking competence in English, and those who were unable to benefit fully from the curriculum in the schools, to the Language Unit. Some parents may speak English at home, while others do not.⁷⁷

Beginning in the early 1970's, the Liverpool Educational services established a language centre. Its object was to provide a degree of competence in English to foreign pupils before they move into the main stream of the educational system.⁷⁸ When the pupil acquires some level of competence, after two or three terms, he or she enters either the primary or secondary school. Even where English language assistance was available, research has shown that pupils who attended English schools for all, or most of their school life, may need continuing English language support. Programmes such as ESL were temporary measures to help these pupils develop better language skills.

Support of Mother-Tongue Education

Lengthy debates had been waged over whether mother-tongue education should be an integral part of the British educational curriculum. In 1976, the European Economic Community (EEC) issued a directive stating that member states should teach the mother-tongue and culture of the country of origin of the children within its jurisdiction.⁷⁹ The Community Relations Commission (incorporated as the Commission for Racial Equality) similarly supported the EEC's directive and expressed the following; " . . . language was an integral part of both culture and religion and in order for the education system to carry out its responsibility in what was officially recognised

as a plural society, the languages of minority groups cannot be left to haphazard support."⁸⁰

Some Local Education Authorities had extended their facilities for mother-tongue classes. ILEA adopted, with the authorities initiative in equal opportunity, a greater emphasis in teaching the mother-tongue and the use of interpreters.⁸¹ Research into the use of the mother-tongue within the school has shown that children learning English, and other subjects, through their mother tongue learn faster.⁸² The use of this procedure was dependent on the number of pupils from the ethnic group in the area. Several educational authorities were providing mother-tongue education to their pupils.

At St. James and St. Peters primary schools in Soho, about a hundred children of various nationalities attend school. Of this number 25 percent were Chinese, 12 percent Bengali, and the rest a mixture of Italian, Spanish, English and other nationalities.⁸³ David Barton, the headmaster, believes that both the child's language and English should be encouraged. Chinese children were encouraged to speak and write Chinese, and Chinese texts were available in the school. Barton believes that children using their mother tongue will improve in their English.⁸⁴ Parents were encouraged to come to school and read stories to the children in their mother-tongue. He believes that "no child should be expected to cast off the language and culture of home as he crosses the school threshold, nor to live and act as though school and home represent two totally separate and different cultures that had to be kept firmly apart."⁸⁵

The ILEA schools and colleges offer Chinese language to the pupils. For example, Waterfield, St. Veronica, North Westminster and Quintin Kynaston secondary schools, and two Further Education colleges (Hackney and North London) offer O-level Chinese.⁸⁶

The City of Newcastle Education Authority does not provide mother-tongue teaching, but they do make available, free of charge, a building for a Chinese Sunday School. Approximately 250 pupils were taught their mother-tongue and their own culture.⁸⁷ Mother-tongue education in Lothian consists of three classes, which meet for two hours on Saturdays and Sundays.

Committing the educational authorities to restructure their curriculum, or to develop programmes to reach all minority children in their ethnic language, will be a horrendous and expensive solution to the problem. The proposition to resolve language deficiencies for all ethnic minority groups may strain and proliferate the limited

resources available to the educational authorities.

CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: THE CHINESE RESPONSE

Isolation, self sufficiency, entrenchment and dependence on the Chinese community had been the response of the Chinese towards assimilation. It was not without its problems, especially when the community was divided by divergences such as regional parochialism, sectional, professional, religious and political disparities.⁸⁸ The internal intricacies of the community springs from a dissimilarity in dialects, social status, place of origin--whether born in Britain or abroad--or even a variation in regional cultural values. Although community solidarity may be essential to cultural preservation, the development of primary relationships, particularly outside the family unit, was an obstacle to their assimilation.

To examine the responses of the Chinese, identifying the problems they face as immigrants were essential. These can be categorised as follows: (a) preservation of culture, (b) concern for the loss of cultural traditions; (c) view and reaction towards education, (d) sending children to China, and (e) mother-tongue education.

Culture and Traditions

Religion has some predominance in the lives of the immigrant Chinese ranging from Buddhism, Taoism and Confucianism to Christianity. They continue the observance of religion centres on the traditional holidays and festivities organised each year by the community. The absence of a Taoist, Buddhist or Confucian place of worship suggests that religion, at least on a primary group level, does not appear to play a strong part in the lives of the Chinese in Britain.

During the early part of 1906 in Liverpool, a room was designated as a temple.⁸⁹ No evidence however, of either temples, or ancestral-halls were found in Chinatown. It can be assumed that the temple or shrine was devoted primarily to private family worship, honouring deceased ancestors. Ancestral worship was common in China. Some Chinese were Christian converts worshipping at the Chinese Church of London, St. Martin's Church and other locations.

Ng states that the Chinese who immigrated to London were generally Buddhists.⁹⁰ He suggests three reasons why a Buddhist "temple" was not built: (a) absence of a concentrated "Chinatown"; (b) women generally participated in religious

activities; and (c) newer immigrants, arriving after 1945, were less superstitious than those who immigrated a century ago.⁹¹ Early residents of London were transient and those who had married local women were unconcerned with religion. Their children attended a Christian Church in Pennyfields, with their English mothers. Chinese men usually found solace in their immediate families and friends instead of religion.

The traditional festival of New Year continues to be a yearly event. *Ch'ing Ming*, the Spring visits to Graves, was organised by the *Chi Kung Tong and See-Yap* District.⁹² However, no records were available of other rituals being practised, such as the traditional ceremony of "brushing the graves."⁹³ Broady explains that in traditional Chinese funerals the gravestones were inscribed in honorific Chinese titles.⁹⁴ Today however, many were inscribed in English.

The *maan-yit*, the first month after a child's birth, may still be observed. In Liverpool, social extravagance has been retained, while the content of traditional ritual has disappeared. Broady believes that since the ritual was meaningful due to a belief in the effective existence of ancestors, its disappearance suggests that the belief was no longer held to be legitimate by the Chinese in Liverpool.⁹⁵ The maintenance of these ceremonies as "social functions" may be viewed as purely secular rather than religious. Broady further believes that "if conspicuous expenditure was no longer motivated by a desire to honour the ancestors, it may still express a desire to demonstrate or to acquire prestige."⁹⁶

The Chinese continue to maintain their traditional organisations. Usually these organisations were clan or district oriented.⁹⁷ People with the same surname, or coming from the same district, organise themselves for recreation, social gatherings and even for protection against discrimination from the core community.

Only a few Chinese organizations were established during the 1960's. One of them was the Chinese Chamber of Commerce in London.⁹⁸ Currently, approximately sixty such organisations were established in Great Britain. About a third of these organisations had been formed since 1980.

The Federation of Chinese Associations in Britain, was founded in 1980 primarily to help the restaurants with employees and to petition the government to issue more work permits to these youth within the scope of traditional Chinese culture.⁹⁹ Twenty-eight community organisations were spread throughout the United Kingdom.¹⁰⁰ These community organisations aim at providing activities for their members and new

year's parties, lion dance classes, and celebration of other traditional festivals.¹⁰¹

C. Chann suggests that a new trend in the Chinese community was beginning to emerge. Some Chinese community centres attempt to maintain popular customs and Chinese culture. These would include *Kung Fu* (martial arts) classes, Cantonese Opera Group, painting and calligraphy, folk and classical dancing, etc.¹⁰² The Swansea Chinese Association, the Surrey and District Chinese Association, the Chinese Youth and Students, Northeast Chinese Association, the East England Chinese Association, to name a few, had been organised and membership was open to all Chinese.¹⁰³

Criticism has been directed against the Chinese organisations. Frequent disapproval was voiced because of "too many leaders and too many organisations, too many Chairmen and too much unity within each different group."¹⁰⁴ . None of the Chinese organizations attempt to provide services to the community as a whole. Due to language barriers, inhibition and differences of attitude and culture many need welfare, legal, and medical assistance.¹⁰⁵ Chinese parents were suspicious of organisations.¹⁰⁶ They would prefer not to join and sometimes forbid their children from joining any organisation. They dislike the attitudes and activities of British youngsters, like disco dancing and frequenting the pubs.¹⁰⁷

The Chinese Secret Society was the oldest in Chinatown and plays an important role within the community. It helps in ritual and mutual aid to its members. Older and wealthier Chinese decide and control the community. Christian Churches sponsor other organizations, such as Mothers' Union, Boys' Brigade, etc., aimed at integrating the Chinese into the British society.¹⁰⁸

Concerns and Maintenance of Culture

Chinese immigrants experience the threat of distillation and even loss of centuries' old cultural traditions. They want to preserve their culture, language and traditions, even demanding these qualities from their children, who generally were born and educated in Britain.¹⁰⁹ Parents find it difficult to keep Chinese traditions alive.¹¹⁰ The replacement of traditional Chinese ways by British culture encompasses such things as Christmas becoming more important than Chinese New Year, western food and clothing. Even the maintenance of traditional and Western medicines were a concern. Many Chinese women still believe in the traditional Chinese herbal medicine and acupuncture.¹¹¹ Western medicine was viewed with skepticism.¹¹²

Cultural value and traditions were encouraged among the Chinese children to help retain their heritage.¹¹³ Young women were restrained from establishing relationships with their British peers because the latter were characterized as permissive. Boys, on the other hand, were allowed to date non-Chinese young women because marriage may be very remote.¹¹⁴ Younger children were usually isolated from their British peers and were required to speak only Chinese.

Discipline was strict, and "pride in their national heritage has caused them to remain in a close-knit group that was further accentuated in their new circumstance by the absence of support from the extended family network."¹¹⁵ Confused parents do not know how best to help their children. It can also lead to the undermining of parental prestige and family discipline, and a loss of traditional values that had played such an important part in Chinese culture.¹¹⁶

Conflicts arise when children begin to ignore their parent's wishes. The result of the conflict between culture and expectations of parents and children was the dilution of tradition. For immigrant parents, confrontations with their children were undesirable. Parents blame their children's problems on the British educational institution and culture. Parents take strict measures to "protect" their children from the British culture. Conflicts occur when parents expect and demand that their children reject the influence of the school and insist they help in the family business and take steps to limit their contact with their classmates.¹¹⁷

Discipline and work ethics were tantamount coupled with a child's obligation and duty to support the family unit. A child's responsibility was to help, obey and care for both parents and family. A major crisis occurs when they ignore or rebel against their moral responsibilities, or disregard the needs of their family. The preservation of culture, linguistic and traditional characteristic were paramount to the Chinese.

Chinese View and Reaction towards Education

Education was highly valued by the Chinese. This attitude was reflected in the exalted and esteemed position held by teachers and scholars.¹¹⁸ The traditional Chinese system of education was formal and clearly defined in respect to discipline and behaviour.

The Chinese system of education places greater emphasis on calligraphy and the memorisation of characters.¹¹⁹ Chinese children "transfer these skills to English,

learning to copy neatly and memorising the spelling of the words . . . copying without understanding and failing to see the links between sound and spelling."¹²⁰

Langton states that parents were dissatisfied with English schools because they see a lack of discipline and a too casual attitude.¹²¹ This dissatisfaction was measured by the lack of homework.¹²² Chinese parents were more accustomed to "book knowledge, literary skills, rote-learning and homework, and fail to appreciate the value of discovery methods and extracurricular activities."¹²³ They were further dismayed with primary education. They do not appreciate the system where children learn through play.¹²⁴ For many it seems that teachers contact them only when their children were doing poorly or were in serious trouble. Despite the parents' overall attitude toward education, the underlying factor that frustrates the credibility of British education was the devaluing of basic Chinese cultural values.

Since most parents were not formally educated, they do not understand the intricacies of the academic system.¹²⁵ Although they were concerned about the welfare of their children, they were reluctant to express their opinion about their children's needs to teachers, because of their English inadequacies.¹²⁶ Consequently, the children's ability to cope and adjust to the new educational environment, and sustain any interest in their studies, were put under great strain. Parents cannot help their children in their education and social life.¹²⁷

Chinese children, from a young age, were taught to be modest, to respect and obey their elders, to be tolerant and to try not to show their emotions.¹²⁸ Children were told what to do, while the British system emphasizes self-initiated work.¹²⁹ Unlike the British, teachers were not questioned but were considered authoritative figures, and students do not look directly at teachers because it was considered the height of rudeness.¹³⁰ Teachers were respected work.

One report suggests parents were to blame for their children's problems, because they were ignorant of their children's needs, and do not attempt to understand them.¹³¹ Parents feel that by providing the essentials, i.e., food, clothing, shelter, and education their children will be happy.¹³² This attitude encourages them to work excessively long hours. One report suggests that "instead of spending time on children and had family life, most fathers gamble excessively when they were off work."¹³³

Sending Children to China

Statistics showing the exact number of parents sending their children to Hong Kong, or the number of children involved in this practice, were unavailable.¹³⁴ Additionally, research showing why parents send their children to their native country, were unavailable. Despite the lack of information, the practice does exist.

From the information available it seems that parents send their children to Hong Kong for several reasons. One was purely economic. Sometimes, due to the demands of the catering business, they cannot adequately care for them. Grandparents, or relatives in Hong Kong, were recruited to care for the children until the business in Britain becomes manageable. In a few cases, newborn babies had been sent back to Hong Kong.¹³⁵ Other parents dissatisfied with the English educational system, had sent their children to Hong Kong to be educated. Others send them back to aid in the retention of their cultural identity. In a few cases, families living in council estates had experienced racial harassment. One mother, isolated linguistically and culturally, eventually, in sheer defence, took her children home, leaving her husband.¹³⁶ This was a pattern common among the Chinese immigrants from the New Territories of Hong Kong.¹³⁷

Sending children to Hong Kong was a temporary solution that generates its own set of problems. Children, who had been raised by grandparents, and ultimately reunited with their parents in Britain, were often unable to recognise them.¹³⁸ Parents do not understand the strain and psychological adjustment that the children had to make to their new surroundings, and to them as well.

Much older, they return to find that learning English was more difficult. Their parent's inability to converse in English only reinforces their problems of adjustment. In fact, the pupils requiring most assistance were the recent immigrants. Pupils, five years old and older, although born in Britain, had almost no understanding of English.¹³⁹ They experience cultural shock becoming withdrawn and quiet, and on occasion, violent and aggressive.¹⁴⁰ One report showed that Chinese children rejoining their parents at the ages of ten or eleven find it impossible to cope with the English school system. This was especially true when their English language skills were not proficient enough to understand the lessons.¹⁴¹ Though parents act with good intentions, the children were severely impeded after spending several years in Hong Kong. Upon their return, the children suffer emotional conflicts as they cope with their

new environment.¹⁴²

Chinese Support of Mother-Tongue Education

One key issue for the Chinese community was the provision of mother-tongue education for their children.¹⁴³ It was believed that family cohesiveness can be promoted by a sharing of the home language.¹⁴⁴ The traditional family structure was threatened, as the young children become far less family oriented. They feel that their children were losing their language and culture through schooling in English.¹⁴⁵

Children growing up with entirely different conceptual values were a realistic concern that widens the gap between parent and child.¹⁴⁶ Parents expect their children to speak Chinese as a matter of necessity. They send their children to Chinese language schools rather than encouraging English proficiency. One parent commented, "At least they [the children] know how to speak Chinese otherwise I really couldn't communicate with them properly."¹⁴⁷ Contrarily, some parents view English as a language of mobility, while Chinese was a language of thinking and belonging.¹⁴⁸ Usually primary children enjoy their Chinese schools but secondary children were harder to persuade to attend.¹⁴⁹

For many Chinese parents teaching their language to preserve their traditions was difficult. At home parents speak to their children in either Cantonese, *Hakka* or Mandarin.¹⁵⁰ Sometimes a mixture of English and Chinese, generally called "pidgin-English," or as one parent describes, "baby-talk," which may not be entirely acceptable because some parents were unfamiliar with the English words. The children speak English with their peers and their brothers and sisters. In one extreme example, the eldest child, who was left to tend his bothers and sisters conversed with them solely in English. They had limited contact with their parents because they were usually working. The father was angry because the children showed him no respect by not talking in Chinese. The report stated that the "inability to speak sufficient Chinese exacerbated the alienation between parents and children."¹⁵¹ Chinese parents believe the learning of the mother tongue was essential to maintain their identity and tradition.¹⁵² This was one reason parents insist that their children learn Chinese, even if it means sending them long distances to special language schools.

Parents want provisions made to teach their children Cantonese or Mandarin to help preserve their cultural heritage.¹⁵³ One report states that the "Chinese language

was very much a cultural vehicle and parents in the catering trade often do not had the time or educational background to foster these values and traditions for their children's benefit."¹⁵⁴

Mother-Tongue Education

Chinese language classes started as early as 1926. In 1960, Chinese language classes were reestablished by the Chinese Chamber of Commerce.¹⁵⁵ When it first began, only one teacher and twenty pupils were present. A survey by the Commission of Racial Equality in 1981 showed sixty language classes¹⁵⁶ with approximately 6,700 Chinese children receiving instruction from 480 part-time instructors throughout Britain. These classes were self-sustained financially. The facilities were poor, inadequately equipped with voluntary tutors not trained as teachers.¹⁵⁷ According to another report, sixty Chinese mother-tongue classes and fifty-six with a total of 6,400 pupils were in existence by 1982.¹⁵⁸ Forty of the fifty-six classes had been established since the later 1970's.

The reasons for the rapid growth of such classes were as follows: (a) an existence of a language and cultural gap that can only be bridged if the children learn their mother-tongue; (b) better organisation and effective professional instructors; (c) permission to use local educational facilities at nominal rent; and (d) the provision of free textbooks and workbooks by the Hong Kong government.¹⁵⁹ In areas where the Chinese community was small they unify the community and become gathering places where friendships were established, English language classes were offered, and social and communal activities were organised.

The district of Lambeth has 180 pupils registered for mother-tongue classes.¹⁶⁰ Children aged four to eighteen attend eight classes and ten parents were learning English. They meet every Saturday from 10.30 to 1:00 p.m. The Wah Sing Chinese Community Centre in Liverpool has two hundred pupils enrolled in their Chinese school. They also organise recreational activities, trips during summer holidays, musical instruction, etc.

Operating mother-tongue classes costs thirteen pounds per class to four pounds seventy-five pence a day for a whole school.¹⁶¹ The ILEA allows free use of their facilities. In the Northwest, other problems include care-taking, particularly on Sundays of the premises being used. In the Manchester area, costs for the letting of

facilities differ in each area.¹⁶² Other costs were involved. Although the teachers give of their time freely, normally their travel expenses were paid and a meal was provided. Added to these expenses were printing, books and equipment, teaching materials, caretakers' fees, etc. which amounts to large expenditures through the year.

Kung Ho Association

A survey of the *Kung Ho* Association was conducted to find out the number of children attending the school. The research was conducted from the application forms of the pupils attending the school, completed in English and Chinese. During the past two or three years, the number of students attending the *Kung Ho* Mother-tongue school in Soho has increased.¹⁶³ In 1982, approximately three hundred forty pupils were registered.

Survey of Kung Ho Association Enrolment: 1982-1984	
Table 21	
Year	Enrolment
1982	340
1983	370
1984	440

Alan M. Uyehara, *Survey of Kung Ho Association*, London, 1985.

According to Mr. Cheung, the headmaster of the school, four hundred forty pupils were registered in 1984. From four hundred forty applications, three hundred fourteen records were available for the research. The purpose of this part of the research was to learn three factors: (a) the number of children born in Britain; (b) the age distribution of the pupils; and (c) sex differentiation.¹⁶⁴

The application, did not specify whether the pupil was "pure Chinese" or from a mixed-marriage. Many forms, were complete by a parent and written in Chinese, suggesting that most of the children came from homes where at least one or both parents were Chinese. Of the three hundred fourteen records available, two hundred eighty-four pupils completed the section on "place of birth."

Kung Ho Association: Birthplace of Children (1982-1984)				
Table 22				
Enrolment	U. K.	Other	No Indication	No Record
440	185	98	31	126

Alan M. Uyehara, *Survey of Kung Ho Association*, London, 1985.

One-hundred eight-five children were born in the United Kingdom and ninety-nine from other countries.¹⁶⁵ About 35 percent of the pupils were born outside the United Kingdom. They were from Hong Kong, a few from Vietnam, and four individuals from Sweden, Holland, and Denmark.

Only three hundred eight applicants showed their birth-date. In the Infants and Junior age group (four to eleven) one hundred seventy-nine pupils were registered. The remaining one hundred twenty-nine were aged twelve through eighteen.¹⁶⁶

Kung Ho Association: Age Distribution (1984)			
Table 23			
Year	4-11 Infants	12-18	No Indication
1984	179	129	6

Alan M. Uyehara, *Survey of Kung Ho Association*, London, 1985.

The number of children in each age group was even, but the older and younger age groups had considerably fewer numbers attending the classes. This could be because parents do not see the immediate need to had their younger children, aged four or five attend the school. The statistics reveal that from age six, the number jumped to twenty-six children attending the language school. Non-attendance by the older student--ages sixteen to eighteen--may suggest that many had completed their British education, and were working.

Of the three hundred eight applicants who listed their birth-date, one hundred thirty-nine males and one hundred sixty-nine females were attending language courses. In the Infant and Junior school age group, seventy-eight boys and one-hundred-one girls had registered as compared with fifty-six boys and sixty-six girls of secondary school age.¹⁶⁷ Of the remaining seven pupils, five seventeen-year-old boys and one girl had registered.

<div> <div>Kung Ho Association: By Gender (1984)</div> <div>Table 24</div> </div>			
Gender	Infants 4-11	Secondary 12-16	16+
MALE	78	56	5
FEMALE	64	60	1

Alan M. Uyehara, *Survey of Kung Ho Association*, London, 1985.

The last was an eighteen-year-old woman. From the statistics, most of the pupils (58 percent) attending the school were aged eleven or younger. This may suggest that the older the child, the more influence the British educational system and their peers had on determining whether they continue to maintain and learn their cultural language.

In summary, several local educational authorities support mother-tongue education. This service was intended to integrate the Chinese population into the British society without disrupting or alienating the Chinese children. Cultural preservation or pluralism, rather than cultural assimilation may be the objective of the British. As for the Chinese parents, their support of the mother tongue was to maintain their culture heritage and a means of communication with their children.

Cultural assimilation was limited for the immigrant Chinese. The children who were born in other countries continue to balance between two worlds, and find it difficult to learn all the ways of the British society. The educational authorities were trying to resolve the problems of cultural assimilation. They were limited by the resources available to them.

Education was undoubtedly the strongest and most important factor influencing cultural assimilation. Education integrates the children into the norms of the core society. Schools teach the cultural heritage, both extrinsic and intrinsic values. Internalisation of such values clashes with and challenges the traditions of the immigrant. Children, delicately wedged between two cultures, were pressured to accept one or the other. A balance between both cultures was possible. The child may choose to accept cultural assimilation or may completely withdraw into the comparative safety of his own cultural community.¹⁶⁸

The next chapter will focus on the structural assimilation of the Chinese. It will determine whether their limited or nonexistent cultural assimilation has influenced their spatial and occupational mobility in the British society.

CHAPTER VIII

STRUCTURAL AND MARITAL ASSIMILATION: 1951-1985

The previous chapters have discussed Chinese assimilation as it relates to Gordon's model regarding structural, cultural and marital assimilation. Using the same indicators and definitions of assimilation, this Chapter will focus on a new generation of Chinese entering Britain from 1951-1985. It will determine how these factors influenced structural and marital assimilation. Emphasis will be placed on determining the conditions that faced the new Chinese immigrant, and their problems of adjustment.

BACKGROUND

A new wave of Chinese immigrants, far exceeding the number of Chinese immigrating before 1950, came to Great Britain.¹ The Chinese who immigrated before and between the two World Wars eventually retired from their employment, or died. After 1945, businessmen, professionals and student nurses, and those employed in the restaurant business² arriving from Hong Kong, rejuvenated the ageing Chinese community. They emigrated to Britain in large numbers for three basic reasons: the uncertainty over the future in China; the growth in Hong Kong's population; and Britain's economic prosperity in the Fifties.³

Hong Kong's development into a highly industrialized country de-emphasized the role of agriculture. Young men working as farmers were educationally ill-equipped to compete with their counterpart who lived in the city.⁴ Eventually many, who had agriculture-related jobs left Hong Kong. Upon their arrival in Britain, many worked in low-paying jobs in the Chinese catering industry. Later, some returned to Hong Kong to marry. As economic circumstances became unbearable, many left their families to return to Britain. They continued to send money home to maintain their families, while they were away.⁵

These men eventually sent for their older sons to help with the running of the family business. Their wives remained in China to care for the younger children and elderly parents. In 1968, changes in British immigration laws, forced the immigrants to send for their families. Soon the wives accompanied the older children to Britain.

The children had the opportunity of finding a new life under what seemed to

them, a better economic, and perhaps educational situation.⁶ Influenced by the British culture, however, some abandoned their traditional values. Western habits were accepted despite parental concerns and objections. This situation made it more difficult and complicated to return to their homeland.⁷

THE CHINESE POPULATION

After the war, and during the early Fifties, the number of Chinese in Britain was small. In 1951, according to one report, 1,350 "China-born Alien" residents lived in London.⁸ Ten years later the number rose to 2,784.⁹ By 1985, an estimated 85,000 to 100,000 Chinese lived in Britain, originally from Mainland China, Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaysia, Taiwan and Southeast Asia.¹⁰ They spoke different dialects and came from various social classes. Some were born overseas, while others were British-born.¹¹

The Chinese community was dispersed throughout the United Kingdom. In 1981, most Chinese lived in London--Tower Hamlets, Camden, Westminster, Kensington, Barnet and Brent, with approximately 45,000 living in the Greater London Area.¹² Tower Hamlets was the oldest inhabited Chinese area in Britain. This area includes Limehouse, where an estimated 4,000-5,000 Chinese live in the Borough, most were new immigrants.¹³ Approximately two hundred Chinese live in Soho, with 2,000 engaged in some type of business in the area. This suggests that many live outside Soho and commute to their place of employment.¹⁴ Of the 19,500 who live in London, 53 percent were male. About half the population were married-- less than half were single, with 3 percent widowed and 1.6 percent divorced.¹⁵ The London Borough of Camden has 2,555 Chinese residents in the Borough, but an independent survey showed the number was closer to 5,000.¹⁶

The Chinese also live in Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Cardiff, Glasgow and Edinburgh.¹⁷ Fifteen-thousand live in Greater Manchester, ten-thousand in Merseyside, two-thousand in South Wales, three-thousand in Birmingham, and twelve-thousand in Scotland.¹⁸

Comparison of Population Statistics: Merseyside 1980			
Table 25			
Merseyside Community Relations Council		University of Liverpool	
Black British	20,000	Black British	10,000
Chinese/Hong Kong	8,000	Chinese/Hong Kong	5,000
West African	3,000	West African	2,500
West Indian	3,000	West Indian	2,500
Indian	2,500	Indian	2,000

HAC II: 119.

The Merseyside Community Relations Council reported that 8,000 Chinese live in Liverpool, while the University of Liverpool, conducting their own research, reported only 5,000 Chinese in the area.¹⁹ In Manchester, according to the 1981 Census, 6,559 Chinese were listed, but local estimates reported 15,000 Chinese²⁰.

In the 1981 Census, 1,211 Chinese living in the City of Manchester were born in Hong Kong. Three-hundred were born in the Peoples Republic of China, making a total of 1,511--930 males and 581 females.²¹ Twelve percent were aged 50 years and over and 12 percent were aged between 36-50, the remainder was below 36 years of age.²²

Three thousand immigrant Chinese live in Glasgow, and two thousand live in South Wales. Seventy percent were less than thirty years of age. Forty percent were women.²³ Most of the Chinese living in Strathclyde had lived in the city for almost fifteen years. Many came from rural backgrounds. They speak either *Hakka* or *Cantonese*.²⁴ According to the 1981 Labour Force Survey, 91,000 people of Chinese origin live in Britain, 24,000 or 25 percent, were British born.²⁵ The remaining three-quarter percent or 75,000, were born elsewhere.

The Problem of Population Statistics

The population statistics of the Chinese were highly debatable. Each source differs, sometimes contradicting other records. One report suggests that the lack of concrete statistics was partly due to policy, and in part, to the isolation of the Chinese in Britain.²⁶ Chinese sources had attributed the discrepancy to large numbers not completing the Census. Their lack of participation was partially due to their

unwillingness to be seen.

Statistics submitted by the Commission for Racial Equality records the breakdown from the 1981 Census, according to the country of birth.²⁷ This information included an individual's *place of birth* rather than racial extraction. It also showed the inclusion of anyone born in that country, whether native or foreign.

Great Britain Population Breakdown by Country of Birth (1981) Table 26	
Far East--(New Commonwealth	
Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore	37,741
Vietnam	13,296
Peoples Republic of China	17,569
Total	167,659

HAC III: 24.

The local councils had not kept information on the housing or socioeconomic characteristics of the Chinese.²⁸ Both local and national government's policies do not require recording the racial or ethnic origins of its residents.²⁹ The lack of information has caused many problems, especially in research, and for agencies attempting to find out the difficulties faced by the Chinese community, to help satisfy their basic needs. The Home Affairs Committee in 1984, after gathering the evidence from many sources for several months, summed up the situation.

Information about the distribution of the Chinese within Britain is even less precise . . . different sources in each area give different estimates of the local Chinese population . . . The lack of accurate figures at local level is of much more than academic significance. It means that local authorities have no reliable way of estimating the size of the Chinese population they should be attempting to serve. Indeed some authorities whose Chinese population is very dispersed may scarcely be aware that they have a Chinese population at all. It makes it harder for them to judge the extent of need and to make effective use of the ethnic data that an increasing number of them are collecting.³⁰

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: EMPLOYMENT IN THE FOOD INDUSTRY

When the Chinese first entered Britain, they were employed as seamen, launderers, and to a lesser degree, caterers. During the 1900-1950 period, Britain had

few Chinese restaurants. The first Chinese restaurant opened in Gerrard Street in 1926.³¹ Most of the newer immigrants, arriving in Britain after 1950, entered the catering industry. The nature of the catering business caused the Chinese to be disperse, so that they would not be competing with each other.

Victor Y. F. Chann of the Hong Kong Government Office offers four possible reasons why the Chinese entered the catering industry. First, most of the immigrants were unskilled. Second, the attitude of self-reliance created the need to have their own business, and to provide employment for their families and relatives. Third, immigration laws required guaranteed employment. Many had friends or relatives who secured them positions in the catering industry. Finally, steady wages, profits and dependable employment induced them to continue in the industry.³²

Through the Sixties and Seventies, the Chinese who emigrated to Great Britain worked in a Chinese restaurant or take-away. By 1980, an estimated 4,000 restaurant outlets and take-aways had been established throughout the country.³³ In 1984, approximately 6,500 restaurants and take-away businesses were established in Britain. By 1984, 95 percent of the British Chinese community was engaged in some aspect of the catering business.³⁴

Take-aways and fish and chip shops became a family enterprise. Parents expected their children to help in the family business. The Merseyside Chinese Youth Association reported that children often worked between 1-8 hours during the day, before or after school and on weekends.³⁵ Parents were criticised by the Local Education Authorities when they kept their children home to help in the family business, or to act as interpreters when needed.³⁶

The number of Chinese involved in the catering industry varies from one part of Britain to another. In Camden, 75 percent of the Chinese community works in catering and 5 percent in the clothing business.³⁷ Those in catering work long hours, often twelve hours a day, six days a week.³⁸ Many retire between sixty and sixty-five years of age without any pension. In Merseyside approximately 90 percent of the Chinese were involved in the catering trade.³⁹ About 60 percent involved, managed take-aways rather than restaurants.

The Council of Chinese Organisations covering the entire North West Area, except Liverpool, reported that more than 60 percent of the employed Chinese population in that area, was in the catering industry.⁴⁰ Chinese employment in the City

of Newcastle centred in the catering industry--restaurants or take-aways.⁴¹

Unemployment

Some Chinese were unemployed. Those affected were the middle-aged and the young. After working for many years and long hours in the catering trade, many had health problems.⁴² Chinese employers were extremely strict. Workers were concerned about jeopardizing their employment by being ill, so they continued working despite health problems. In fact they lose their employment if they were sick for more than a week, or were continuously ill.⁴³ Despite these health problems, they do not necessarily receive welfare assistance, due to their inability to speak English to appeal for such benefits from the government.⁴⁴

In Edinburgh, unemployment in the Chinese community was low, compared with the national average.⁴⁵ Some men over the age of fifty were unemployed due to ill-health.⁴⁶ The Inner London Educational Authority (ILEA) reported, for the school year (1983-1984), the following information. The proportion of unemployed Chinese parents were higher for parents of children in secondary schools. It was higher than primary aged children.⁴⁷ A high degree of single parent families was unemployed. Statistics show that the difference was 62 percent among single parents with five year olds, compared with 43 percent among single parents with eleven year olds.⁴⁸ ILEA adjusted the figures since fewer Far Eastern children come from single parent families. The adjusted results show that unemployment of Chinese parents was 23 percent for primary children, and 22 percent for secondary children. In comparison, it was 16 percent and 12 percent respectively for all pupils.⁴⁹ A few Chinese were "white-collar" workers in the Post Office. A handful of Ph.D.s cannot find work. They had no option but to return to the family business.⁵⁰ With the recession problems of the 80s, unemployment has affected the lives of the Chinese community. The unstable economy has forced some provincial restaurants to close, leaving staff unemployed, without any hopes of regaining employment.

In summary, the first generation Chinese population was heavily confined to one occupation--the catering industry. It limits primary relationships with the British. Movement to other occupations was almost nonexistent. Even those who possess skills may be unable to find positions commensurate with their abilities and experience. For the immigrant Chinese, structural assimilation through employment was nonexistent and

further limits their association with the British society.

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: SETTLEMENT

As Chinese families settled in Britain, they tried to live near the place of their employment, since the wages were low and the finishing time late.⁵¹ Wives and children, whose husbands or fathers had worked as single men for years, continued living in the same small room allocated to him by his employer or rented a private accommodation. Sometimes finding appropriately sized flats was difficult for the employer.⁵² Without question, housing became an immediate problem and a burden.

The Chinese community can be grouped into three categories: (a) owners of their own accommodations; (b) renters of private housing; and (c) renters dependent on the local councils for their housing. Property owners usually live in areas populated by the local British. Children had little association with their British peer group. Most confine their activities to the home, and to the family business. The second group, renting private accommodations were more isolated, and often had greater numbers of people living in the homes. Their primary relationships were centred on family members and their own peer group. Finally, those housed in council housing, had been dispersed and mixed with other ethnic groups. They, by choice, limit their primary relationship to their own family and ethnic group.

According to the Labour Survey of 1981, the average household size was 3.52, as compared to the national average of 2.67.⁵³ The largest category of household size was "six or more people" or 20 percent, as compared to the national average of 4 percent. This suggests that households consist of immediate and extended families, probably living in cramped quarters.

Household Size: Great Britain Table 27		
	Percentages Head of Household of Chinese Ethnic Origin	All Households
One Person	17	22
Two Persons	19	32
Three Persons	16	17
Four Persons	17	18
Five Persons	12	7
Six Persons	20	4
Average Household Size	3.52	2.67

HAC III: 17.

Problems relating to housing were consistent throughout the country. Recent studies by the Roundabout International Centre in Edinburgh, and Merseyside Improved Housing Association in Liverpool, show that considerable housing needs had not been resolved by the public sector.⁵⁴ The Liverpool report suggests that the elderly Chinese do not take advantage of Local Authority Housing services.⁵⁵ They choose to live in substandard housing provided by the Chinese community, rather than live in an area where they were isolated from members of their own ethnic group. Their inability to speak English was another factor that deters their movement into better accommodations. Many Chinese live in the private rented sector in extremely poor, overcrowded housing conditions.⁵⁶

In July 1979, the Liverpool for Merseyside Improved Houses, conducted a survey into the housing of the Chinese community. They surveyed one hundred forty-one families, focussing on three areas: (a) private/rental accommodations; (b) owner/occupation accommodation; and (c) public housing accommodation.⁵⁷

The survey showed thirty-four families, or about 24 percent, living in private housing. One in three used their bedroom as their eating room. One in two families shared a cooker, bath and a lavatory, and common stairway, hallway or common landing with other households. As high as one in three also shared a room, usually their living room with another household.⁵⁸

Sixty-four families live in owner-occupied accommodations, and a total of 54 families owned their own property in General Improvement Areas and Housing Action

Areas.⁵⁹ This number represents 45 percent of those surveyed, or less than half who own their own property. Only ten of the 54 families, had applied for any assistance or grants for improvements. The others did not apply because they could not understand the forms.

Forty-three families, or 31 percent fall in the category of public housing accommodation, and thirty-seven live as Council tenants. The remaining six live in Housing Association property.⁶⁰ The survey reveals that most of the families require larger accommodations, usually four bedrooms.

In Glasgow, it was estimated that 50 percent of the Chinese were owner occupiers, and the remainder live in private accommodations.⁶¹ In the Northwest area of Britain, it was reported that 70 percent of the Chinese own homes. "...they were traditionally indisposed to rent a business property upon which their solvency was so dependent."⁶² Most of their businesses were also used as living accommodations.

Local Councils feel a definite need for lowcost, centrally-located housing that will allow the community to remain as a cohesive entity.⁶³ Generally, housing was found through the assistance of friends, or by word of mouth, rather than through commercial or state agencies.⁶⁴ For the Chinese it does not matter who owns the property as long as it has cheap rates and easy access to trains or buses. Rents range from 15 to 25 pounds a week for a room. Many who were unfamiliar with housing regulations find it almost impossible to obtain a rent or rate allowance from the government, because they did not have rent books. Also, they had their rents automatically deducted from their wages by the employer or landlord.⁶⁵

Most of the Chinese in Newcastle live in privately rented accommodations.⁶⁶ This was an assumption because the Chinese community was self-sufficient, having little contact with the City's housing department. The Council believes that many Chinese live in substandard housing, due to their lack of knowledge of laws and responsibilities relating to property purchase and ownership.

The Lothian Regional Council states that housing among the Chinese population was a problem. Many Chinese live in overcrowded and below standard housing.⁶⁷ Problems arise because the Chinese community was unfamiliar with the laws and regulations concerning housing and other services available to the community. A few local governments were unaware that the Chinese suffer many disadvantages with respect to their housing needs. This happens because the Chinese do not represent a

large group, or the council did not have adequate information to assess their situation.

In the Borough of Camden, researchers find that most of the families living around Covent Gardens, and the Seven Dials areas of Soho, were in privately-rented housing.⁶⁸ These were usually substandard, overcrowded and overpriced.⁶⁹ Many families live in one room, sharing basic amenities--cooker, cold water, outside WC--with three or four other families.⁷⁰

Councils also face problems in housing families in bed and breakfast hostels. One report states that rents were about 42 pounds per head per week for a double room for two people. They were provided with nothing more than a bunk bed, table and chairs. Some pay more than 60 pounds per week for a tiny room of about 100-150 square feet.⁷¹ A three-bedroom council flat, in contrast to other lodgings with modern central heating, only costs about 40 pounds per week to rent.⁷²

The problems of housing continue, and the recent Chinese immigrants, those immigrating after 1960, still find it difficult to assimilate into the community. Their unfamiliarity with the laws governing housing, augmented by their lack of English only isolates them economically, and to a degree, geographically from the British society.

Problems in Council Housing

Chinese in Council housing face problems such as noise, disputes with neighbours, isolation, racial harassment and communications with Estate Managers.⁷³ One Borough reported that the Chinese tenants were disadvantaged by the language barrier and cannot report housing problems they were encountering.⁷⁴ The record also shows that the Chinese cannot receive take-up rates of rent, rate rebates and improvement grants because they do not understand the system and English.⁷⁵

In both public and private sectors, housing tenants were frequently reluctant to make complaints, and do not take up benefits because they were unaware of their entitlements.⁷⁶ Criticism was raised by some who feel that the allocation of council flats was discriminatory and unfair.⁷⁷ Statements such as, "My next door English neighbour got a housing transfer very quickly, and although I applied before her ages ago, I'm still stuck with this damp old flat," or "I hardly came across any Chinese families who were allocated the newer council properties although the Chinese had been around for donkey years" were common.⁷⁸

In summary, the Chinese population was dependent on the local government and

restaurant owners for their housing. Others rent, or own take-away business that also includes their living quarters. Since the community was dispersed throughout Britain, integration into the British society was limited because they remain isolated, confining their primary relationships to family and other Chinese.

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: THE BRITISH RESPONSE

The assimilation of the Chinese was restricted due to the perspectives of the Chinese and British communities. The failure to assimilate was partly due to the influx of new groups of Chinese immigrants, arriving after 1950. With the rapid growth of Chinese, particularly after 1960, their difficulties increased. Combined with the problems left unresolved from previous immigrant groups, assimilation was nonexistent, and the community remains ethnically enclosed with its own traditions, values and culture.

Since the British government permitted immigrants to enter with few restrictions, little foresight was given to the implications of new policies and legislation on the social, economic and political structure of the country. Government and society viewed each new immigrant group differently.

Before the investigation by the Race Relations and Immigration subcommittee of the Home Affairs Committee in the 1984-1985 Session, matters concerning the Chinese as a whole were limited.⁷⁹ However, responsibility must be placed on the shoulders of the British governmental agencies. They had insufficient demographic data, and a deficiency of statistical information of the community.⁸⁰ Moreover, they could not provide adequate services if they were unable to speak in the appropriate dialect or dialects of the Chinese community.⁸¹

Attempts had been made in some areas of Britain, to assimilate the Chinese. In Manchester, the Education and Social Services Departments meet regularly with representatives of the Chinese Education, Culture, and Community Centre.⁸² These consultations were intended to inform the Council officers of any difficulties members of the Chinese community had concerning the education service. They were also to provide information about changes that might affect them.⁸³

In the recent Home Affairs Committee investigation concerning the Chinese community, several recommendations had been made to improve their situation, particularly as it applies to housing. These recommendations were as follows:

(a) The Department of the Environment and local authority housing departments should examine the extent to which they make information and assistance on housing matters available to the Chinese and make any necessary improvements; (b) Local authorities and housing associations should, when building or refurbishing, bear in mind the need for larger housing units in areas inhabited by the Chinese and by other ethnic minorities whose average family size is large; and (c) Housing departments and housing associations should bear in mind the particular needs of the Chinese, in common with those of other families which serve the city centres, and ensure that characteristics of the Chinese way of life do not unfairly disadvantage the Chinese in the allocation of local authority and housing association accommodation.⁸⁴

Despite a firm stance by the government, only time will determine whether these recommendations were accepted.

Immigration Laws and Regulations: Implications

Immigration laws were developed to regulate the conditions controlling entrance of aliens into Britain. Admission can be denied, disallowing the alien to question the courts, or the administrative acts of the Crown.⁸⁵ The courts agreed that a citizen of one country had no right to enter the territory of that other country against the will of its Government.⁸⁶ In 1891, though the specific reason was not stated, a Chinese by the name of Chun Teeong Toy was disallowed entry into British territory, although he was a British subject.⁸⁷ This action suggests that an alien's request was determined by the government, and may be rejected, for a just or unjust reason, logical or illogical judgement.

After World War II, several immigration laws were passed by the government that were not specifically enacted to single-out Chinese immigration. The Aliens Order of 1953 specified and required aliens entering the United Kingdom, intending to work, or seek employment, receive a work permit issued by the Department of employment.⁸⁸ Each permit allowed the recipient twelve months, renewable for one year. After four years, the government usually removed the restrictions.⁸⁹

The Commonwealth Immigrants Act (1962), provided stringent controls and abolished the right of free entry. It intended to control the immigrants from the

Commonwealth, and not to discriminate on the grounds of colour or race. The Act effectively limited the admission of coloured immigrants to Britain.⁹⁰ Commonwealth and United Kingdom citizens with passports not issued in the United Kingdom, or by their authorities in the overseas offices, were not allowed to settle in Britain. A Ministry of Labour employment voucher was now required before immigrants were allowed entry.⁹¹ The result of the Immigration Act (1962), was that only certain professional workers can obtain employment vouchers. Jobs in other categories had become virtually nonexistent.⁹²

The Act of 1965, which originally set the number of vouchers at twenty thousand per year, was changed to 8,500 a year. Of this number 1,000 were reserved for immigrants from Malta.⁹³ It also withdrew the free admission of children, sixteen years of age, from entering Britain to join one or both parents, and constricted the receipt of a Ministry of Labour voucher.⁹⁴ These actions persuaded many people to come to Britain before the new law was introduced and became effective. The voucher system dramatically reduced the number of new heads of households.⁹⁵

The Commonwealth Immigrants Act (1968) was designed to reduce the number of coloured citizens to the United Kingdom who had previously been allowed to enter Britain because their passports had been issued by United Kingdom authorities.⁹⁶ Its aims were to control the immigration of East African Asians. It divided holders of United Kingdom passports into two separate categories--those who could enter Britain and those who could not.⁹⁷ The Labour Government received criticism that they had "shamelessly yet shamefully devalued the British passport and created first and second class citizens."⁹⁸ Also, the Act tried to control the entry of Commonwealth citizens retaining citizenship, who might later settle in Britain. Finally, the Act disallowed the right of a male Commonwealth citizen to settle in Britain, even if his wife was already settled in England.

The Immigration Act (1971) was established "to bring together the separate systems of entry for aliens and Commonwealth citizens."⁹⁹ It was also more complex.

...the 1971 Immigration Act . . . creates a plethora of different categories of citizens and non-citizens, and leaves numbers of people stranded in the middle of nowhere--citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies who are patrials, and those who are not . . . British subjects who are pariahs, and those who are not; British subjects who are not patrials but who were

residents in this country when the 1971 Act was passed; aliens who are citizens of other member countries of the EEC and can therefore benefit from its provisions for the free movement of labour, and those who are not; and various small groups of British protected person and so on.¹⁰⁰

The status between citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies was defined and categorised into two areas--patrials and non-patrials. The former being divided into three categories: (a) citizens of the U. K. and Colonies who were born, adopted, naturalised or registered as such in the U. K., or who were the children or grandchildren of such persons; (b) citizens of the U. K. and Colonies resident in the U. K. anytime for a continuous period of five years; and (c) a Commonwealth citizen who was the child or legally adopted child of a U. K. citizen born in the U. K.¹⁰¹ Non-patrials included all aliens and Commonwealth citizens who continued to be governed under the 1968 Act. Their stay was limited. Commonwealth citizens still maintain the right to vote but were required to register with the Department of Employment. Aliens, on the other hand, had no right to vote and must register with the police.¹⁰²

Wives and children immigrating to Britain had gradually outnumbered the unaccompanied male arrivals.¹⁰³ One report suggests that the 1971 Immigration Act, designed to curb and reduce immigration into Britain, had the opposite effect for elderly Chinese.¹⁰⁴ Before the Act was carried out, many Chinese, mostly those more than sixty years of age, fearing the Act would separate them from their families, immigrated to the United Kingdom. Many had preferred living in Hong Kong, or their villages, than in cramped and sunless existence in London, or another city.¹⁰⁵

An investigation carried out by the Home Office between mid-1977 and mid-1979 revealed that many Chinese, working in the catering industry, got their permits by false references.¹⁰⁶ Before 1979, the Department of Employment established a quota of 1,500 work permits for semiskilled workers in the catering and restaurant trade. After 1979, the quota was altered, and "effectively closed an important avenue of primary immigration for people from Hong Kong and with it, the scope for significant abuse of the control."¹⁰⁷

In 1980 and 1981, the Home Office issued only 126 and 116 work permits respectively to people from Hong Kong, in spite of the quota of 150 set by the government.¹⁰⁸ An analysis of work permits issued under the 1984 quota shows that of

the 150 permits available to citizens from Hong Kong, the government issued only six to workers outside the catering trade.¹⁰⁹ One memorandum submitted to the House Affairs Committee, suggested that the quota for work permits be relaxed to allow more Chinese to immigrate and be employed in the Chinese restaurants. The Chinese had insufficient staff which directly and adversely affected the trade.¹¹⁰ Considering the current situation, the government will not issue work permits in the catering industry until satisfied that the industry can absorb the current Chinese workforce.

The British Nationality Act (1981) came into effect on 1 January 1983.¹¹¹ One major aspect of the Act relates to the immigration of husbands. This concerned the abuse of marriage regulations, particularly in the Indian subcontinent, by men seeking admittance into the United Kingdom. It allowed British officials to determine subjectively the primary purpose of such marriages, and judge whether the reason for an engagement or impending marriage was justified under the new regulations.¹¹² Statistics showed the effect of the immigration laws from 1980-1983, and 636 Chinese were refused leave to land.¹¹³ The new Act was seen to "further large extensions of executive discretion and the erosion of traditional rights."¹¹⁴ Persons born in the United Kingdom no longer had the unrestrictive right to enter or remain in the United Kingdom. Only British citizens were free to leave, or enter the country without any restrictions. British Overseas citizens and citizens of British Dependent Territories had no such rights.¹¹⁵

In addition, the Act requires a greater selectivity and assessment of whether applicants for naturalisation had sufficient knowledge of English.¹¹⁶ The Secretary of State, has the right to waive the language requirement if the applicant's age, physical condition, or mental condition, make it unreasonable for the individual to fulfill the requirement.¹¹⁷ Applicants who were more than fifty years of age and had lived in Britain for fifteen years were usually not required to attend an interview.¹¹⁸ About one-third of the applicants, were asked to attend interviews, to find out the applicant's ability to use English.¹¹⁹ Approximately 35 percent of the applicants were naturalised because of marriage to a British citizen.¹²⁰

Since the implementation of the Act (1981), 1.5 percent of the applicants had been refused on the condition of not satisfying the language requirement.¹²¹ Records of aged relatives and male finances from Hong Kong had been furnished to the Home Office by a foreign and Commonwealth officer. In 1982 it was reported that one

hundred elderly relatives of British citizens, wishing to settle in Britain, had been cleared, but sixty-six had been refused entry.¹²² Elderly people refused entry had not proved their dependence on their relatives in the United Kingdom--a fundamental criteria for admission.¹²³ The Home Office, in defence of their immigration policy, can only identify five cases between 1980-1983, who had been refused entry into the United Kingdom.¹²⁴

These immigration laws and current revisions of past laws had a profound impact on the number of immigrants allowed to settle or enter the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom Immigration Advisory Service (UKIAS) reports that the number of persons accepted for settlement in the United Kingdom in 1982 from the Commonwealth, and Pakistan, was the lowest since 1962.¹²⁵ The reasons can be attributed to new regulations in force in 1982 that require husbands, seeking admission for settlement, enter for twelve months, but who can later be granted settlement privileges or be deported from the country.¹²⁶ Another reason for the reduction in the number of immigrants was attributed to a drastic reduction in the number of foreign nationals accepted for settlement in approved employment. Filipino women, initially admitted in the late seventies, as long term work permit holders, also decreased in numbers.¹²⁷

In 1982, under the new scheme, approximately one hundred Commonwealth citizens from Hong Kong obtained long term permits, lasting for eleven months or longer.

...there is a concessionary quota scheme for the dependent territories. Under this a limited number of permits are issued to workers who do not meet the normal skills requirements. The size of the quota is kept under review and currently is set at 200 permits a year, of which no more than 150 may be issued for any one territory. In recent years Hong Kong has taken up the maximum allowance of work permits. Virtually all the permits go to young workers in the Chinese catering trade.¹²⁸

Despite these conditions, recent questions concerning the obtaining of work permits became an issue for the Chinese community. Initially, the semiskilled workers, replacing individuals who had retired or immigrated to Europe or America, obtained permits. Only certain professionals and workers could obtain employment vouchers

because of the Immigration Act (1962). Jobs in other categories were nonexistent for Chinese employers.¹²⁹

From 1971-1983, only 2,961 employment vouchers or work permits were issued, but 15,479 dependents were allowed to immigrant to the United Kingdom.¹³⁰ The number of refusals of people holding British Dependent Territories passports issued in Hong Kong declined from 0.8 percent in 1977 to 0.3 percent in 1983.¹³¹ Most of the refusals were to visitors who did not satisfy the immigration officer that they intended staying for a limited period.¹³²

Passengers Seeking Leave to Enter the United Kingdom Who Had British Dependent Territories Passports Issued in Hong Kong							
Table 28							
	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
Total Ad	27,000	32,500	36,000	41,000	47,000	48,000	50,900
Vis Ad less than 12 months	13,600	16,000	16,000	20,300	23,700	25,200	27,300
Students	2,500	3,700	4,700	4,000	3,900	4,200	5,800
Wrk Pmt holders	235	280	270	150	140	250	230
Tot Acpt for Settle							
-on arrival	950	730	740	720	620	420	400
-on removal	730	550	770	990	830	650	650
of time limit							
Refused leave to enter	232	168	223	199	174	125	138
Deported	12	6	11	6	1	21	19

HAC II: 147.

Currently, families were trying to help their elderly parents to immigrate into Britain. This process was arduous, often complex and extremely frustrating for the immigrant. Countless individuals were seeking permanent residency in Britain. The reasons were varied: reuniting with loved-ones, safety for their lives, etc. It remains exceedingly difficult for elderly dependents of immigrants settled in Britain to convince immigration authorities that their visit was temporary.¹³³ This implies that an elderly grandparent, whose living standard was not higher than that of their family in Britain, will likely be refused admission. Yet families with elderly parents in Hong Kong still wished their relatives join them in Britain. The most common reasons parents were refused entry were: (a) they show some indication that they want to settle permanently; (b) the son cannot show that he was the sole supporter of the elderly parent(s) because

of the existence of other family members in Hong Kong; and (c) the mother has not reached the normal retiring age of sixty.¹³⁴ According to one report, elderly parents seldom remain for a long period in Britain anyway, due to the adverse weather conditions.

One case concerned a widowed dependent mother affected by paragraph 48 of the House of Commons article 394.¹³⁵ She lived in Hong Kong and had requested permission to join her son, and his family in England. She was denied because she was not wholly, or mainly dependent upon the sponsor (her son in England) for support. Upon further investigation, the government reversed the decision after she proved that she was dependent on her son. Paragraph 48 stipulated that a close relative can qualify only if he or she can step into the shoes of the sponsor in supporting the dependent relative. Though this individual received entrance, countless others were frustrated in their attempts to join their families in Britain.

Leaders in the Chinese community feel that the British government's policies relating to immigration should be relaxed to allow the Chinese family unit to be preserved through immigration.¹³⁶ These include "brothers and sisters, parents and immediate relatives, and lowering the parents' age for settling in the U. K. from the existing limit, to 55 or below, provided they do not live on social security."¹³⁷ The results of having elderly parents unite with their children will, as the Chinese argue, "provide valuable assistance to their well-being, and act as guardians for advice and self-help."¹³⁸

The Home Affairs Committee has also addressed the problems of immigration and nationality for the Chinese and other minority groups. Several recommendations were made to compensate and alleviate the difficulties faced by the Chinese. One recommendation was that "the Home Office should take steps to publicise the law and regulations relating to immigration and nationality more effectively, particularly among minorities like the Chinese who had few English speakers."¹³⁹ The second and third recommendations state that regulations affecting elderly parents should be flexible, and applications for longer visits should receive sympathetic considerations.¹⁴⁰ Despite the efforts of the government to resolve some difficulties of the Chinese in this area, the recommendations were only "recommendations." As proposed, these suggestions will not change current practices or improve immigration procedures of the British government for the Chinese or other minority groups.

In summary, laws and regulations had controlled the growth of the Chinese community. Yet recent efforts by the British government, particularly the convening of the Home Affairs Committee, had shown an attempt to resolve the problems faced by the Chinese community. The investigation has opened the channels of communication between both communities so that the Chinese community can be integrated into the British society.

MARITAL ASSIMILATION

Many Chinese men who came to work in the catering industry were single. Many left wives and children, hoping to "strike it rich" and eventually return to their homeland. The growth in the numbers of Chinese women coming to Britain increased the possibilities for endogamous marriages for the single men. Some met their wives or husbands in Britain, while others had marriages arranged by their families within their homelands. As immigration regulations became more stringent, families came to Britain to avoid new regulations that would curtail and limit further immigration.

Survey Number of Chinese Marriages in Britain 1951-1980 Table 29					
YEAR	MIXED MARRIAGES	%	ENDOGENOUS MARRIAGES	%	TOTAL
1951-1960	895	57	680	43	1,575
1961-1970	1,708	35	3,188	65	4,896
1971-1980	2,962	28	7,435	72	10,397

Alan M. Uyehara, *Research Statistics: Marriage Registers at St. Catherine's House*, London, 1986.

After 1945, the number of Chinese or endogamous marriages began to increase. Since 1950, and especially in the 1960s and 1970s, immigration expanded from Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaysia and other cities. The number of endogamous marriages grew, due to the increase of Chinese women. The survey, discussed in Chapter IV, showed that for the ten-year period of 1961-1970, 5,000 marriages were performed. Approximately 3,000 endogamous marriages or 65 percent of the total number were recorded for that period. From 1971-1980, the number doubled to 10,000 marriages or 70 percent.

Most of these marriages were first generation Chinese. Conversely, the number of mixed-marriages steadily decreased from 77 percent in 1941-1950 to 28 percent by 1980.¹⁴¹ Clearly when marriageable persons within a minority group were available, endogamous marriages were more possible. In essence, during the post 1950 period, more Chinese entered Britain with families. The increase in number of single Chinese also suggests that when marriageable partners were available within the same ethnic group, the Chinese would favour endogamous marriages. Mixed marriages had become less dominant and the second generation Chinese were more likely to marry within their own ethnic group. As the options for such marriages increase, the Chinese community will continue to be identified as a separate ethnic group. They will not be, in Gordon's terms, completely assimilated to the point that their ethnic identity will no longer be distinguishable.

This Chapter has been concerned with the problems of assimilation, and has pursued an analysis on how settlement, employment, and marriage had affected the assimilation of the Chinese immigrants. The post-1950 Chinese were faced with the same problems faced by previous Chinese immigrants. Their settlement was scattered due to the location of their businesses, throughout various cities. Yet, the hub of their business and settlement centred in Chinatown. Intermarriages or endogamous marriages were dependent on the number of marriageable Chinese. As the years passed, more endogamous marriages were performed because of the availability of Chinese mates.

The next chapter will focus on the education of Chinese pupils from 1951-1985. The study will show the issues and challenges faced by the Chinese children and their cultural and structural assimilation in the educational system.

CHAPTER IX
THE EDUCATION OF CHINESE PUPILS
1951-1985

BACKGROUND

Previous chapters have shown the challenges faced by Chinese children in the educational system. The objective of this chapter is to investigate the cultural and structural assimilation of Chinese pupils using the same indicators in previous chapters. This chapter will describe and assess the Chinese within the context of how the educational institutions have influenced them. In addition, the intent is to ascertain the degree to which the Chinese pupil has accepted or rejected the cultural traditions of the British society.

The analysis of cultural assimilation will focus on intrinsic and extrinsic indicators. Intrinsic values are religious beliefs and practices, ethical values, folk recreational patterns, literature, historical language, and sense of a common past (cultural heritage). The other is extrinsic--dress, manners, patterns of emotional expression and minor oddities in pronouncing and inflecting English. The acceptance or rejection of these indicators will determine the degree to which the Chinese pupil has culturally assimilated in the British society. Contrary, the rejection or preservation of these ethnic traditions will indicate both intrinsic and extrinsic values they are maintaining. The assimilation model suggests that extrinsically, pupils entering the school system are assimilated, at least, culturally. Pupils acquire the dialects, intonation, language, slang, etc. of the core community in which they live, more specifically the language of the pupils they associate. Outwardly, they are usually dressed similarly to the core society.

The examination of the Chinese pupil will also focus on structural assimilation indicators regarding the establishment of primary relationships, movement through the educational system and entrance to higher education/training, occupational opportunities, and interaction with peer groups. These indicators are as follows: (1) employment or occupation; (2) primary relationships--admittance into the clubs, cliques, etc.; and (3) spatial mobility within the context of educational advancement not only through the primary and secondary levels but to higher education or training.

The Problem of Adequate Information

Throughout the materials researched, many writers and researchers have underscored the insufficient studies on the Chinese pupil. More than 30,000 Chinese pupils are enrolled in schools, and it is difficult to assess their educational attainment. Volumes of research have been conducted on West Indian and Asian pupils, but researchers like Monica Taylor believe that studies regarding pupils of Chinese origin is limited—only descriptive, anecdotal and impressionistic.¹ Anne Garvey and Brian Jackson described the Chinese children's population as "shrapnel through British schools" because they "pop-up in twos and threes, in tiny groups not worthy of the title of 'problem.'"² Douglas Jones writes that the danger of the dispersal of the Chinese community will produce more discrimination rather than retard their ability in English.³ Other problems are created by the dispersal of the Chinese. The Swann Report states, "the scattered nature of the Chinese population also exacerbates the isolation of mothers and children who may not speak English."⁴ Furthermore, the Chinese pupil, where they have formed a large population, only represents 5 percent of a mainstream school population.⁵ "Thus Chinese children are likely to attend schools with few if any other pupils of Chinese origin."⁶ "Although schools in urban areas are likely to have other ethnic minority pupils, in some rural parts of the country to which the Chinese have dispersed the schools which they attend may be all-white."⁷

Insufficient and definitive data and information in most of the educational aspects of the Chinese population amplifies the problem of comprehending the extent to which the Chinese pupils have or have not been assimilated. This problem manifests itself in most areas of the education of the Chinese pupil. Although the Chinese may need to modify their attitude, and make an attempt towards cultural accommodation, researchers, as mentioned above and others, clearly repeat that language and cultural expectations are major challenges for the Chinese pupil. This study will attempt to analyse cultural and structural assimilation using the limited studies regarding the Chinese pupil.

The Chinese Pupil

Chinese children can be divided into two major groups: first time immigrants who

accompany their parents, and those born in the United Kingdom and later sent to live with extended family members in Hong Kong. The reason to return is to regain and maintain their Chinese culture, and to help parents save enough money to start their own business.⁸ The latter group suffers the same problems as the first group of children. Their entry or re-entry into the British school system is traumatic, often bewildering the child with the formidable challenges of learning English and a new social environment. However, there is some evidence that this practice is declining and being replaced by having a relative join the family in Britain to take care of the children.⁹

The British-born children's population is growing. They face difficulties, especially cultural conflict between school and home, parents and peers, and perhaps racialism. They will fair much better than those children sent back to Hong Kong, and later return to Britain after several years.¹⁰ The British-born Chinese have a sense of pride in their culture, and a belief in the superiority of the Chinese.¹¹ A few Chinese children feel that learning Chinese is a waste of time.¹²

Promotion in British schools is determined by age, which the typical Chinese school is determined by achievement.¹³ Additional problems arise as the child is unable to cope with the curriculum.

CULTURAL ASSIMILATION

Preceding chapters have laid a foundation regarding the Chinese living in Britain. Chinese immigrants arrived at different times as explained in earlier chapters. Chinese settlers arriving in Britain during the 1900s, married British women, and had children. Their children attended the local schools. The children were influenced by their British mothers. They spoke English as their first language, and learned the traditions and values of the British society. Many have assimilated into the British society.

After 1950, a larger number of Chinese arrived in Britain, bringing families with them. They were immigrants, most coming from Hong Kong. Unlike the initial Chinese seamen who came in the 1900s and had married British women, these immigrants and their children spoke only Chinese. Now, adjusting to a new culture and environment, they were faced with a totally new set of cultural standards that challenged their own traditional

values and language. Enrolled in the British educational system, they had to learn English and to adapt the expectations of the educational system. For some, it took months, even years, to learn the language or even learn how to adapt to a new way of life. Others never mastered the language. Patricia Langton states that the English language was a formidable challenge to the children.¹⁴

Compulsory education required parents to send their children to school. Once the children entered the British school, parents had no control of the curriculum nor the values and traditions taught to their children. Conflicts arose between parent and child, and even with the school, as these new values challenged their ethnic traditions.

Ethnic Values: The Impact of the British Educational System

The traditional values of the British society are transmitted through the curriculum, and inherent in the educational system. Education, often centred on national examination, drives the curriculum that all pupils must study. Schools, therefore, influence the lives of all children no matter their ethnic background. Each pupil has to adjust and accept the challenges presented to them. Unlike the greater community where all people are governed by a broader aspect of rules and regulations, the microcosm of an educational system limits the choices and options of the pupil. Within its boundaries, the school system dictates the courses, the curriculum and the domain all pupils. Under these circumstances, the Chinese pupils enter.

The curriculum dictates what the pupils must learn. The medium of instruction is English, and the subjects studied for major examinations is in English. Success or failure in national tests determines the options of the pupil. They can enter the university or technical schools so they can qualify for occupations outside the traditional catering trade. When children attend the schools of the core society, it is evident that the cultural values and traditions are embedded in the lives of each child. Chinese pupils, as other ethnic children, are influenced by cultural assimilation. As indicators of cultural assimilation, they accept the dress of the British, and speak in the same inflections as others living in the same geographical region. They are expected to compete with other children, and meet the expectations of the educational system. In other words, they are immersed and comply

with the same standards expected by the system. The educational system is in fact a society within itself where pupils comply with the norms established by the educational system.

The cultural values of the British have influenced the Chinese children. One of the common complaints of the Chinese parents is that teenage children do not obey them.¹⁵ Even Chinese girls are faced with clashes of traditional Chinese values on their lives. Tradition says that girls should not have a good education which endangers them from being a good mother and faithful wife.¹⁶

Cultural Preservation

This section will discuss ways in which the Chinese pupils or their parents have tried to preserve their culture. These can be categorised into intrinsic and extrinsic values. The establishment of Chinese schools has encouraged parents to send their children so that each child would not grow up divorced from the Chinese culture.¹⁷ In an attempt to assist in the assimilation of the Chinese pupil, different methodology, besides teaching English as a Second language has been developed. To help the pupil adjust to school, one report suggests that teachers must disseminate this culture through other disciplines—Chinese classics and poetry through English translations, which could greatly improve their understanding of English.¹⁸

Mother tongue language schools have been established to maintain culture tradition. This has been explained in detail in Chapter VII. The Chinese, with cultural classes, attempt to appease parents who feel that their children are losing their Chinese identity. As a result, there has been an increased demand for places in Chinese language classes. This situation has limited the need for parents to send their children to Hong Kong to learn Chinese and acquire a ‘Chinese outlook’.¹⁹

In a country giving women equality, in traditional Chinese culture women are discouraged from educational attainment.²⁰ Women should be mothers and a faithful wife. Chinese girls, when interviewed by Chan, complained that they were not treated equally to Chinese boys.²¹

Chinese pupils bring their cultural and traditional values with them into the British

school system--Confucian ethic of respect, diffidence to authority, modesty, etc. These values are apart of their characteristic and can be a positive in their transition into the school system. The Chinese are open minded and can incorporate a number of philosophies into their own philosophy and religion.²² One facet of Chinese values that may cause conflict is excessive modesty--the refusal to undress for gymnastics.²³ Another example is a sexual segregation--a male pupil refused to be paired with a girl.²⁴

Chinese Parents: Maintaining Traditions

Previous chapters have addressed the attitude of the Chinese parents. The Chinese, as a result of their occupations, do not compete with the British for the same jobs. They are considered self-reliant and generally, do not feel that they are not objects of discrimination.²⁵ They are concerned about how the British view them which are attributed to their cultural values of keeping their integrity. Chan believes that the country belongs to the British and racial and discriminatory practices against the Chinese are justified.²⁶

Against the background of the Chinese perception of their British hosts, the success of failure of the Chinese pupil can be attributed to the attitude of their parents. The attitudes of Chinese parents need to be evaluated so that their intentions can be analysed to determine whether they encourage or discourage cultural assimilation. As with most first generation immigrants, there seems to be a need to cling to traditions that identify the group. Language and other cultural activities are encouraged, even mandated so that the cultural traditions can be passed on from one generation to another.

Education is held very high in the Chinese culture. Traditional learning and subjects are essential to success in the family and society. Parents seem to be dissatisfied with the British school curriculum.²⁷ Entering into a new educational system with different aims, the Chinese parents mistrust British schools because of the lack of discipline, informal learning which leads to the children adopting bad attitudes and lack of respect for authority and a contempt for learning.²⁸ Some families have sent their children back to Hong Kong for part of their education. Upon returning in their teenage years, these children not only have to adjust to British schools, but must readjust and establish relationships with members of their own family as well.²⁹

Chinese parents speak little or no English, and in restaurants usually the waiters speak English while other employees, who have not contact with people outside the business or community, speak Chinese.³⁰ Parents want their children to attend the language schools, and are willing to pay for these classes. In addition, parents often pressure their children to leave school as early as possible to work in the family business.³¹

Some parents do not allow their children "to study sufficiently or provide suitable study conditions" for their examinations but still require them to work in the family business.³² Economics and the need for financial viability seem more important to the family, and parents send mixed messages as traditional values or expectations versus the high regard for education often conflict.

There is a lack of parental involvement in the school. One reason is because of the high proportion of Chinese parents who do not speak English. Chinese parents assume that the school will totally guide the child as to its best interest especially in matters of subject. They tend to leave matters concerning education to the school.³³

Chinese parents expect their children, when leaving school, to work in the family business. Usually, the children work in the family business or with a family relation or a friend, when they leave school. Conflicts arise between the expectations Chinese parents and the host community if a child is bright enough to further his education by taking 'O' and 'A' levels.³⁴

Intrinsic Indicators: Historical Language

Mother-tongue education is a key issue for the Chinese community. Chapter VII has addressed some of the concerns of mother-tongue education. Research was conducted with the *Kung Ho* School and can be found in Chapter VII. The Chinese community as a whole is dependent on their mother tongue. Many families believe that it is essential that their children need to maintain their language so that they will not lose their cultural identity and weaken their ability to communicate with other family members.

Chinese language schools have been established to teach more than 6,700 Chinese pupils who are dispersed throughout the United Kingdom.³⁵ The number of pupils attending these schools are substantial. In areas where the Chinese community is small it

becomes a gathering place to establish associations and friendships. The establishment of the language schools requires the children to be bilingual in Chinese and English.

Extrinsic Indicators: Dress, Manners, Patterns of Emotional Expression, and English

A 1946 friendship study conducted in Liverpool, comparing a total of 1048 children from different ethnic backgrounds, made an assessment on the interaction of this diverse group based on a standard of clothing of the pupils.³⁶ It should be noted that most of the Chinese children were from mixed-marriages, and may have had a socioeconomic advantage over other children. The results showed that the Chinese children were the best dressed. When making friends, children with superior clothing discriminated against inferior clothing children. Today, the children are dressed appropriately in their school uniform.

A measure of cultural assimilation, at least an outward sign, is the acquisition of the English language—oral, written and reading. As first and generation Chinese enter the country, the children are expected to learn English. Compulsory education requires all children to attend school, whether they are academically prepared or not. Naturally, as these new immigrants attend school, many will not have the necessary skills in English. The acquisition of English influences the development of primary relationships, and what is more important, structural assimilation through employment. This section will examine the English language acquisition of the Chinese pupil and how it has influenced their cultural and structural assimilation.

Language, as Watson explains, has been a critical issue for most educationists.³⁷ Irene Loh Lynn, like many other researchers and writers, emphasised that the English language was a main problem not only for migrating children but for children who were born in Britain.³⁸ This is also reiterated by numerous studies. The Swann reports that there is a direct relationship between the success of Chinese children in school and their ability to use and learn English.³⁹ The problem is exacerbated by the dispersal of the Chinese community throughout Britain, and suggests that where there are small or limited numbers of Chinese children attending local schools may not have adequate English language instruction or support.⁴⁰

Within the walls of these institutions, English language is not only the medium of communication but the vehicle to learn all the subjects necessary to complete their primary, secondary, and for some, university education. The more they are proficient in English the more success they will encounter. For many of the pupils, which have been stated over and over again, they lack these English skills.

In a research by Alfred Chan, he shows that 21 per cent believed that they could achieve university education, in light of their English abilities, while 48 percent felt adequate in day-to-day English conversation.⁴¹ Poor English is the major factor for the academic problems of the Chinese children.⁴²

Another extension of effect of English is the relationship with parent and child which may accentuate cultural or generation gaps. Conflicts may arise as the children learn English at school and find that they are unable to communicate with their parents. This situation is clearly shared by all minority groups.⁴³

Three surveys by teachers assessed the knowledge and proficiency of Chinese pupils in spoken English. Rosen and Burgess (1980) research showed 18 percent of 33 Cantonese speakers were "unambiguous speakers of English," while 82 percent incorporated Cantonese into their spoken English.⁴⁴ Forty-six percent of the Cantonese speakers were considered as fluent speakers of English, 36 percent as intermediate and 18 percent beginning speakers of English.

Stages of Competence in English of Chinese-Speaking Pupils in ILEA, 1981, 1983,1985 (Percentages)					
Table 30					
Year	Beginners %	Second Stage %	Third Stage %	Fluent %	Total No.
1981	17.2	21.6	24.9	36.4	2237
1983	16.1	22.8	25	36.5	2825
1985	14.7	26.4	27.3	31.2	3546

Monica Marie Taylor, *Chinese Pupils in Britain: A Review of Research into the Education of Pupils of Chinese Origin*, (NFER-Nelson, 1987) 141.

In 1981 and 1983, the percentage of other ethnic foreign language-speaking pupils who spoke English fluently was 46.7 and 43.4 percent as compared to 36.4 and 35.5 percent of Chinese speakers.⁴⁵

There is no definitive answer why the Chinese pupil has difficulty with English. There are plausible explanations for these problems of English language acquisition. Some researchers have compared the similarities of Cantonese with English. These, they say, may be the cause of the childrens' problems of learning English well. Others have shown that parents expect their children to speak in the native tongue at home or while speaking to them. Others have encouraged the growth of the Mother-tongue language schools to preserve the native language.

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION

One of the primary signs of structural assimilation is the development of primary relationships with the British society. Without basic cultural assimilation indicators, the development of these relationships is almost doomed. Educational attainment can affect structural assimilation, frequently influencing the type of occupation selected.

employment or occupation

Primary Relationships

Structural assimilation is defined as the development of primary relationships with peers and teachers. Within the school environment, relationships are extremely important as pupils integrate into the school. How successful their integration or assimilation will play a part as to how successful they will be at school. Friendships are an integral part of socialisation, and contribute to the general welfare of the pupil. When primary relationships are developed with other ethnic groups, integration and assimilation are more possible. Exclusion, whether self-imposed or through discrimination or for whatever reason, tends to isolate the student and short-circuits the assimilation process.

One way of knowing whether a Chinese pupil has integrated or established primary relationship is the ability of the Chinese pupil to make friends with members of his peer group. As the children advance in age, researchers have shown that primary relationships

with their peers to be limited, even to the point of social isolation for some pupils.⁴⁶

The Chinese pupils face many challenges as they enter school. Beside subject learning, social relationships may be difficult to establish. English is seen as a major deterrent in establishing primary relationships.⁴⁷ Few Chinese pupils participate in extracurricular activities. Ladlow suggests that Chinese adolescents do not make friends because of their lifestyle is different from their peers.⁴⁸ Expectations by their parents also amplify the problem of establishing relationships outside of school as well. Parents expect their children to come home, study and help in the family business, often monopolizing their children's free time. Finally, where the pupil live depends how severe the problem will become. If the child lives in a community with little or no Chinese families, their only relationships can be developed with members of that community. In addition, relationships with other Chinese pupils may be dependent on the Chinese-dialect spoken. Pupils of Chinese origin who speak Cantonese, Hakka, Mandarin or Vietnamese of Chinese ethnicity may not develop primary relationships. Furthermore it is suggested that these children may establish primary relationships with other minorities than with the white British peers.⁴⁹

In many places, particularly in some towns, the Chinese community is relatively small. The organisation of Chinese classes has become the unifying force of the community in the locality and surrounding areas. It has become the regular meeting place for parents, children and overseas students. Friendships are developed, particularly among mothers. They discuss personal, communal problems, solutions and assistance.

Employment

Most of the Chinese community have been locked into the restaurant and catering trade. In 1978 there were estimated to be some 6,500 Chinese restaurant and take away in this county. Many are family businesses, often relying of all members of the family to support the business. Children work long hours, and do not have much to spend with friends after school. Homework or revision must be done in between times and after a long day's work. Leisure time is limited, and sometimes children do not attend to school in order to work, help care for family members or other tasks needed by the family.

Educational attainment influences employment not only for members of the core society but also minority groups. The higher the educational achievement, the better the job. Within the British society, like any other, evidence of educational attainment can show the direction of the Chinese in their structural assimilation where they can compete with other people in Britain for equal political, social, economic, educational, and career opportunities. If they are capable of achieving greater educational success, they will have the opportunity of leaving the catering or catering related industries. In reality, however, the high rate of unemployment for youth has made it difficult for the Chinese youth to secure jobs outside of the catering trade. Their parents are angry because of spending so much time at school, and now obtain positions that are equivalent to their non-English speaking parents.⁵⁰ Anne Garvey and Brian Jackson gives an example of a pupil who begins his studies at 11:30 in the evening after he had "cashed up the till and served the last of the late-night customers in the take-away."⁵¹ Alfred Chan indicates that economics of the family comes first. One parent stated, "We can't close for a few days, all the customers will have disappeared when we open again. We are a family business, we can only survive by running it as a family . . . "⁵²

In a survey conducted by Chan, he took a sample of pupils less than 21 years of age. The majority had either worked part or full-time in a Chinese restaurant or take-away shop.⁵³ Eighty-eight percent worked in a Chinese restaurant with better pay.⁵⁴ British-born youngsters do not want to be limited to the catering trade. Some even speak of going to Hong Kong to avoid working in the family restaurant.⁵⁵

Despite the conflicts which do arise between youngsters and their parents over careers, the general view of those who gave evidence to us was that the youngsters usually bowed ultimately to their parents' wishes since 'it was in their nature to be obedient'. An important factor at present militating against Chinese youngsters seeking other career opportunities is of course high youth unemployment and we have heard of cases where youngsters had left home to find other work but had eventually had to return to work in the family restaurant since they had not been able to find work elsewhere.⁵⁶

Taylor, like other researchers, echoes the same suggestions that the Chinese pupils should be presented with a wider range of employment opportunities.⁵⁷ More work, she

suggests, needs to be done to determine the pressure of economic recession has on Chinese pupils despite restrictions on its opportunities of expansion.⁵⁸ Pupils needed to be guided according to their aspirations, expectations and attitudes with their ability and opportunity, and matched to available employment.⁵⁹ One teacher believes that Chinese pupils should have a good basic education so that they can have options outside the family business.⁶⁰

Parents are concerned with the employment of their children. To them it is a matter of employment, and it is their belief that the family business can provide that employment even if other work opportunities are available.⁶¹ Taylor concludes "interaction with wider society may have increased performance as the second generation of Chinese, largely UK-born, participate in the British educational system."⁶² Finally, the second generation chance of diversifying their employment may be dependent on their educational achievements.⁶³

Educational Mobility: Educational Achievements

Success in the examinations shows the degree in which the Chinese pupil has mastered English, which is extrinsic in nature. Through their success, it is a way that they will enter into higher education. The university or higher education may expand their occupational opportunity to move into other levels of the British society and make structural assimilation more attainable. Yet, evidence on examination performance is almost nonexistent.⁶⁴

The deficiency in the use of the English language has a direct correlation as to how a pupil will perform in an examination. The Chinese pupils, as mentioned in previous sections, have had to adjust to many circumstances. Schooling is a challenge, as the medium of instruction is English. How many succeed in the examinations is difficult to ascertain, primarily due to a paucity of evidence, because of the dispersal of the Chinese pupils, and to the absence of ethnically based educational statistics and research.⁶⁵ The lack of English competency is a critical component in examination performance, and has direct correlation to the success or failure of a pupil. Pupils having elementary English competencies when they arrive in Britain, and in their teens with more English confidence, lack the vocabulary and grammar needed to succeed in examinations.⁶⁶

Pupils born in the UK were more likely to be successful in their examinations that lead to entrance in professional occupations.⁶⁷ But, in a 1982 conference, it was reported that Chinese pupils left school without any examination qualifications due to the lack of English language tuition. In one school, Chinese pupils constitute the largest ethnic minority group of 18 percent, 5 percent of another class, comprising only 3 percent of a GCE with some CSE stream.⁶⁸ Unfortunately, the result only show a small segment of the Chinese pupils population but a report from the Home Affairs Committee suggests that the Chinese pupil perform considerably better than other ethnic groups.⁶⁹

It is apparent that English is essential for employment, at least with the context of the British society. Eighty-three pupils were interviewed, and sixty-nine had taken CSE or GCE examinations. Five children were raised in Britain and were encouraged to pursue a professional career.⁷⁰ Sixty-four percent obtained no qualification.⁷¹ The dearth of information regarding the educational achievement of Chinese pupils and the absence of ethnically-based educational statistics, make it extremely difficult to definitively ascertain the status of the Chinese pupil. However, reports from teachers, give a strong indication that Chinese pupils, in general, may be underachieving due to the lack of strong language capabilities and lack of a culturally-based curriculum to meet the needs of all minority pupils.⁷²

Educational Mobility: Further and Higher Education

Information on Chinese entering higher and further education has not been documented well. Educational attainment, examinations, and language competencies are essential for attendance at this level. Overseas students make up a large majority of Chinese attending the institutions of higher learning. Again, parental influence has been a vital factor in encouraging their children to attend school beyond the statutory leaving age.⁷³ Chinese parents that if children have the opportunity to work that they should leave school. Other, however, have encouraged their children to continue with their education. Conflict of evidence and information need to be resolve, so that a better picture of the Chinese community can be shown.

Another factor that needs to be considered in the availability of jobs for the Chinese

student who continues. In a country where unemployment is high, and in some district higher than another, education may not be a viable choice but employment. The question to whether education can provide more opportunities than the traditional take-away business and is crucial to one's survival.

Conclusion

Much of the research and writing regarding the Chinese community has been limited to descriptive, anecdotal and impressionistic. The dispersal of the Chinese community has made it difficult for some local educational authorities to meet the needs of the Chinese pupil. In areas where concentrated numbers of Chinese reside, particularly in London, adequate use of resources can be utilised to help in their assimilation.

Education is an important tool towards cultural assimilation. The clashes between the British and Chinese cultures are natural outcomes due to the role of educational institutions. Values and traditions are challenged, and the monolithic educational system will continue to instruct pupils to meet their expectations.

Within the walls of these institutions, English language is not only the medium of communication but the vehicle to learn all the subjects necessary to complete their primary, secondary, and for some, university education. The use of English, in conversation, writing, and reading, is an essential tool in the educational scene. As Chinese pupils become proficient in the usage of English, their ability to learn the subjects necessary for examination—GCSE, O and A levels will increase. With the present situation, and from the research in various quarters, the Chinese pupil has difficulty in English.

Through laws, parents are compelled to send their children to school. In essence, the school is responsible for teaching the subjects which are mandatory and essential for the passing of examinations outlined by the National Education Department and administered by the local educational authority. When Chinese parents allow their children to enter this system, without question, British values are ingrained in the lives of the pupils.

Obviously, Chinese parents, as shown in this and other chapters, are concerned about the maintenance of their culture. Many situations have been described to indicate that their wish is to live as Chinese, with all their culture, without sacrificing their

"Chineseness." In essence they are being Chinese without accepting the British culture. Once they have let their children attend the educational institutions, they have relinquished their control over the assimilation of their children. If they wish to maintain their own culture, then ethnically enclosed schools should be established so they can preserve their own culture. Losing control, and trying to preserve their culture through language schools may be successful in the short run, but may lessen as new generations of children grow up, and are influenced more by the British culture. If parents, at least the first generation, want their children to succeed in Britain, they must be willing to let their children succeed by learning the language and culture of the British. Without these skills, their children will find it extremely difficult to compete with their British peers.

First and foremost, is the acceptance or rejection of the English. Once children are enrolled in the British schools, the Chinese must accept the consequences, particularly the loss or dilution of their native language. English becomes the vehicle to transport the Chinese through the maze of the English society. Without compliance, Chinese children can neither compete nor be structurally accepted into the British society. Once the decision is made to admit children to the school system, there is little control as to how much language acquisition will be allowed. There is no turning back. As a result, the maintenance of their cultural traditions, and remain ethnically closed, they have chosen to establish their own ethnic schools. In this way the impact of the British society has very little effect on the lives of minority children.

The next chapter will discuss the Chinese living in Hawaii. An examination will be made on their cultural and structural assimilation, using the same indicators, into the Hawaiian society.

CHAPTER X

THE CHINESE IN HAWAII

CULTURAL, STRUCTURAL AND MARITAL ASSIMILATION

The hypothetical basis of this study, and the use of assimilation indicators are explained in Chapter I. The three components of Gordon's model--cultural (the process of change or abandonment of cultural traditions and the acceptance of new values), structural (the development of primary relationships that influences an individual's entrance into the social cliques, organisations, and institutional activities) and marital (intermarriage) assimilation--categorises the distinctive areas of assimilation. This Chapter will establish the comparative inquiry and model, using these three components and its indicators to assess the Chinese in Hawaii.

BACKGROUND

Hawaii has eight islands--Kauai, Oahu, Molokai, Lanai, Maui, Hawaii, Niihau, and Kahoolawe. Niihau is owned privately, and Kahoolawe is an uninhabited island.¹ Approximately 60 percent of the population lives on the island of Oahu, the second largest island in the Hawaiian island chain.²

For approximately one thousand years, before the arrival of Westerners, a strict feudal code of ethics governed the people of Hawaii. Their origin has been the subject of conjecture by many scholars. Fishing and agriculture were their main source of a livelihood. In 1778, the English seaman, Captain James Cook, discovered these islands.³ Shortly, traders, merchants, and missionaries arrived to pursue their own self-interests by exploiting the land and the people. The unsuspecting Hawaiians became the victims of these outsiders.

During the nineteenth century, sandalwood was a flourishing industry. Hawaii became a key port of trade for China's demanding need for this precious commodity. Large quantities of timber were shipped to Canton, where it was used to make incense sticks or carved images.⁴ Imprudent and unlimited harvesting caused the extinction of these trees, and by 1825 the industry had collapsed.⁵

Whaling became the next major industry. After a few years, as world market conditions changed and with the disinterest in the product, whaling lost its importance.⁶

Subsequently, the sugar industry replaced whaling. In 1835, the first successful sugar plantation was established. By 1850, it had become the major industry of the islands.⁷

POPULATION BY ETHNIC GROUPS IN HAWAII 1860, 1866 & 1872 Table 31					
Year	Hawaiians and Part Hawaiians	Caucasians	Chinese	Others	Total
1860	66,984	1,600	700	516	69,800
1866	58,765	2,200	1,200	794	62,959
1872	51,531	2,944	2,038	384	56,897

Romanzo Adams, *The Peoples of Hawaii: A Statistical Study*, (E. H. Winkle, Honolulu, Hawaii, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1933), 9.

Scholars question the actual population of Hawaii before the arrival of Cook in 1778. When he discovered Hawaii, his officers estimated the native Hawaiian population to be between 300,000 and 500,000.⁸ The first missionaries arrived in Hawaii in 1817. In 1820, three years later, approximately 135,000 Hawaiians were enumerated, a considerable decrease in the numbers originally recorded by Cook. In each resulting census, the records showed a significant decline in the native population. By 1876, only fifty seven-thousand Hawaiians were recorded.⁹ The devastating diseases introduced by the Westerners,¹⁰ i.e., measles, colds, venereal, etc. had decimated the Hawaiian population.

Kamehameha III was the first to recognise the population issue.¹¹ The problem became more apparent in the reign of Kamehameha IV. In his opening address to the 1855 legislature he suggested that reducing disease, and enlisting other Polynesians to intermarry with the Hawaiians would regenerate the dwindling population.¹² Responding to the first recommendation, the legislature quickly passed Acts relating to public health, reducing prostitution, and establishing public hospitals.¹³ Eventually, a plan proposing to bring immigrants from other Polynesian islands was considered, but later abandoned because of the lack of funds.

The possible extinction of the Hawaiian race continued to be a major problem despite efforts by the government to control its decline through legislation. King

Kalaukaua, in a speech to the Legislative Assembly on 30 April 1874, expressed his distress. He felt that the problem, and that associated with the agricultural industry, could be resolved through either voluntary or assisted immigration from abroad.

The Hawaiian population continued to decline, even with the introduction of immigrants from many countries.¹⁴ By 1930, the native population numbered 23,723 but the combination of the Caucasian-Hawaiian and Asiatic-Hawaiian population totalled 41,750 suggesting that the government's plan to preserve the Hawaiian population was succeeding.¹⁵

THE PROBLEM

It is unknown when the first Chinese arrived in the islands. As early as 1776, a few Chinese lived in Hawaii.¹⁶ The sailing vessels that traded with Hawaii gradually employed the Chinese. Later, some settled in Honolulu.

With the decline of the Hawaiian population, the government considered hiring Chinese coolies to work on the plantations with the hope that they would intermarry. They were impressed with the few Chinese merchants, planters, mechanics and house servants living in Hawaii, some of whom had married the native women.¹⁷

POPULATION OF CHINESE IN HAWAII 1853-1930 Table 32							
Year	Male	Female	Total	Year	Male	Female	Total
1853	344	20	364	1890	15,343	1,409	16,752
1860	620	80	700	1896	19,167	2,449	21,616
1866	1,090	110	1,200	1900	22,296	3,471	25,767
1872	1,881	157	2,038	1910	17,149	4,526	21,675
1878	2,264	998	3,262	1920	16,197	7,310	23,507
1884	4,016	2596	6,612	1930	16,561	10,618	27,179

Romanzo Adams, *The Peoples of Hawaii: A Statistical Study* (E.H. Winkle, Honolulu, Hawaii, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1933), 8, 9.

Chinese immigration was not unique, but had been going on for hundreds of years. Countless numbers resettled throughout Southeast Asia and other parts of the world. When the sugar planters advertised for workers and promised to pay for their

passage, provide housing, besides an annual salary, many Chinese jumped at the opportunity.¹⁸ They contracted to work for five years for about thirty-six dollars per year.¹⁹

By the 1850's, the plantations had recruited the Chinese in large numbers as indentured labourers. Most were Cantonese speakers from the Chungshan district, in the lower part of the Pearl River Delta.²⁰ Between 1853-1900, more than fifty thousand coolies were enlisted to work on the plantations, which represented 90 percent of all indenture labourers.²¹ The following table shows a total of 56,720 Chinese arriving in Hawaii between 1852-1899.

Arrival of Chinese in Hawaii: 1852-1899					
Table 33					
Year	Arrivals	Year	Arrivals	Year	Arrivals
1852	293	1868	51	1884	2,708
1853	64	1869	78	1885	3,108
1854	12	1870	305	1886	1,766
1855	61	1871	223	1887	1,546
1856	23	1872	61	1888	1,526
1857	14	1873	48	1889	439
1858	13	1874	62	1890	654
1859	171	1875	151	1891	1,386
1860	21	1876	1,283	1892	1,802
1861	2	1877	557	1893	981
1862	13	1878	2,464	1894	1,459
1863	8	1879	3,812	1895	2,734
1864	9	1880	2,505	1896	5,280
1865	615	1881	3,924	1897	4,481
1866	117	1882	1,362	1898	3,100
1867	210	1883	4,243	1899	975

Clarence Glick, *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese Migrants in Hawaii* (Honolulu, Hawaii, University Press of Hawaii, 1980), 12.

The majority regarded themselves as sojourners, awaiting their return to China. They continued to support their families financially in China by sending part of their wages to them. As time passed, most of them became dissatisfied with the plantation life and ended their contract when it expired. A few returned to China, others moved to Honolulu. A small number remained on the plantations.

After the Chinese left the plantations, they moved to the capital of Honolulu where they congregated in an area known as Chinatown. Here they resisted cultural

assimilation, preferring the security of their own group. Due to their working class background, and lack of skills, it was almost impossible for them to assimilate into the Hawaiian society. Gordon suggests that this problem is common for immigrants. Most newcomers need and prefer the security of a communal life made up of their fellow immigrants from their homeland.²²

CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: RELIGION

In the early nineteenth century, zealous missionaries from New England states such as Boston, Massachusetts and surrounding areas were concerned with the spiritual and moral well-being of the Hawaiians. They came to "save" the people by converting them to Christianity.²³ They systematically introduced and taught Christian ethics and Western education.

The Chinese religious concerns centred in the traditions of Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism. They were content to believe in their own gods. Primary relationships revolved within their own group, limiting their exposure to Christianity. The missionaries concentrated on the conversion of the Hawaiian race and were not particularly concerned with the other ethnic groups who had come as indentured labourers. Eventually, as a few Chinese accepted Christianity, they built churches for their congregations. It became an alternate religion for the immigrant and succeeding generations.

In summary, the immigrant generation evidently did not feel a need to be converted to Christianity because they were content to have their own religion. Religion and tradition were intertwined in their lifestyle; one could not be separated without destroying the other. For the second generation exposed to the traditions of the Hawaiian society dominated by Western ideologies, the acceptance of Christian beliefs was easier.

CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: EDUCATION

One major concern of the early missionaries was education. By 1840, a school system consisting of three types of institutions had been established: the boarding school; teacher training schools; and common schools scattered throughout the islands taught by native teachers.²⁴ In the same year, approximately 15,000 pupils attended schools. Most were children.²⁵

After Hawaii became a territory of the United States in 1898, compulsory education became a requirement for all ethnic groups.²⁶ The numbers of immigrant children increased, becoming a concern for the government. Questions were raised on how to Americanise the alien children.²⁷ The government concluded that "scores of thousands of children, whose ancestral cultural background is Oriental, must be brought up to have the social and governmental ideals, characteristic of a typical American community of the mainland portion of the United States."²⁸ The public school system was recognized as the only way to Americanise these children.

Between 1919-1920 the National Bureau of Education appointed a commission to survey the schools in Hawaii. They concluded that foreign-language schools were obstacles to the work of Americanisation.²⁹ In addition, they believed that certain educational materials, the qualifications of some teachers, and the study of the foreign languages by very young children interfered with their learning the English language.³⁰

Their respect for education has always been high in their cultural tradition. In no other country had the scholar been held in such high regard for so many centuries as in China. Parents considered education a valuable asset for their children. The attitude of school children toward their studies depended in considerable measure on the appreciation of education manifested by their parents and friends. Many Chinese arriving in Hawaii did not, in their youth, participate in the educational opportunities of their new country because they had to work to survive. Under the more favourable economic situation in Hawaii, they were willing to give their children educational opportunities and stressed the importance of an education.³¹

A report by the United States Department of Commerce in 1970, explained that of the total number of Chinese aged 25 years and older, (227,165 Chinese in the United States), only 25,205 (11.1 percent) lacked a formal education.³² Statistically the Chinese have a high educational record. The median number of years completed in Hawaii by Chinese pupils in 1970 was 12.4 years and only 4.2 percent lacked schooling. Also, 66.1 percent were high school graduates that, when compared with some Chinese communities in the Mainland United States, were extremely high. In Hawaii, 28.4 percent of this group over the age of twenty-five attended colleges or universities and 18 percent of them completed four or more years.³³ Their educational attainment has enabled them to enter the technical and professional fields, competing with other ethnic groups in those areas.

Years of School Completed by Persons 25 years and Over by Race in 1970 Table 34				
	Chinese	White	Black	Japanese
Total 25 years	227,165	109,900,000	10,375,000	353,707
No Schooling	11.1	1.6	3.3	1.8
Elementary				
1-4	5.1	3.9	11.3	2.4
5-7	10.7	8.3	18.7	6.3
8 years	5.6	13.6	10.5	8.5
High School				
1-3	9.7	16.5	24.8	12.3
4 years	21.2	35.2	21.2	39.3
College				
1-3	11.0	10.7	5.9	13.6
4 years	25.6	11.6	4.4	15.9
Median School Years	12.4	12.2	9.8	12.5
% High School Graduates	57.8	52.3	31.4	68.8

U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Subject Report*, PC (1)C1, PC (2)1B, PC (2)1G, 1970, 59.

The educational profile of the Chinese, when compared with the Whites, Blacks and Japanese, is a dichotomy in the number of highly educated and illiterate Chinese. This comparison represents both the highest and lowest level of educational attainment.³⁴ Perhaps this situation can be attributed to the growing number of immigrant first generation Chinese who have limited or no education at all. Despite this difference, the Chinese as a group are highly educated and rate second of four groups, after the Japanese (68.8 percent), in the number of high school graduates. Their high level of educational attainment may suggest that their Chinese traditional attitudes and values toward education have influenced the attitude of parents and children. They recognise the effect it has on future employment.

Gordon believes in three variables of class position, namely, economic, political power and status.³⁵ He states, "those who are high in economic power tend to be high in political power and in social status."³⁶ He asserts that a college education is the passport to upper-middle class status. The educational attainments of the second generation Chinese soon propelled them into the middle and upper-middle class of Hawaii. They became the community's business executives and professionals. Many owned middle-sized business concerns, and were middle-level executives of large corporations, doctors, lawyers, architects, engineers, scientists, clergymen, college

professors and executives of the various service and civic bureaucracies.³⁷ It then follows, as Gordon claims, that the social class develops its own network of characteristic organisations, institutional activities, and social cliques.³⁸ In Hawaii, as the Chinese were culturally assimilated through their educational attainment, they experienced social and financial upward mobility and entered the organisations that had formerly excluded them.

In summary, the exposure to the American public school system and adopting English as their native tongue, affected the second generation's cultural assimilation. Compulsory education became the vehicle that gave them the opportunity of moving into the middle and upper-middle classes. Their educational attainment moved them out of the unskilled and stereotyped employment into the more professional and skilled occupations in America. Because of education, they could compete with members of the American society, and step-by-step entered the cliques, clubs and institutions of the host society.

For the Chinese, education became the avenue to cultural and structural assimilation into the Hawaiian society. It was prized as a means to occupational and economic stability within the traditional system. In another aspect, their cultural assimilation compromised their traditional culture, replacing Chinese values with Western convictions.

The Chinese, especially the second generation who attended the American schools, learned these basic values and traditions. Educational indicators show that, in Hawaii, the possession of higher educational qualification opened opportunities for Chinese immigrants. Finally, the social acceptance of the Chinese is more favourable than that found in other parts of the United States.³⁹

CULTURAL ASSIMILATION: MOTHER-TONGUE EDUCATION

Chinese immigrants attempted to reduce the impact of the American and Hawaiian society upon their children by stressing the importance of their own culture. One way parents reduced the effects of cultural assimilation was by returning their children to China for their formal education. Another was by establishing mother-tongue education.

It is not known how many children returned to China for their formal education. The practice, however, was prevalent. Clarence Glick states, "hundreds of Hawaii-

born boys, especially eldest sons, were sent back to China to live in the villages with their fathers' relatives and attend the clan schools."⁴⁰ Later, as young men, they returned to Hawaii to work either in the family business or another occupation.

Chinese language schools were established to instruct the children in their native Cantonese language. Initially, children were taught privately at home, eventually however, Caucasians established mission schools in or near Chinatown.⁴¹ These schools opened in the evenings. Later classes were taught in nearly all the Chinese Christian churches, usually after school hours or on Saturdays.⁴² In 1911, two Chinese language schools opened in Chinatown. Over the years, an additional twenty-eight opened in Honolulu, and on the islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai.⁴³

After World War I, obstacles to the Americanisation process began to surface. The government became alarmed at the growth of Japanese language schools and passed legislation to stop their development.⁴⁴ The foreign-language school was identified as the main barrier to the acquisition of the English language. Government officials believed that the assimilation of foreign nationals should centre on the English language and customs of America. Consequently, they endeavoured to regulate the language schools and limit the negative influence they had on the Americanisation process of all immigrants.⁴⁵ Although this legislation was directed against the Japanese language schools, it also affected the existing Chinese language schools. Eventually, as the succeeding generations became disinterested in their children learning their parent's native language, the need for mother-tongue education diminished.

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: PLANTATION EMPLOYMENT

The native Hawaiian deplored the work on the plantations. They disliked the arduous and strenuous work in the cane fields, and resented their dominance and management by the caucasians (*haole*).⁴⁶ As a result, the sugar planters were forced to look elsewhere for labourers. After the passage of the Masters and Servants Act of 1850, which established the Hawaiian Board of Immigration, the planters recruited labourers from Asia.⁴⁷ Over a period of seventy years, they employed approximately four-hundred-thousand indentured labourers.

Before 1880 the Chinese were the main labour force on the plantations. Glick explains that the Chinese lacked opportunities for promotion in the plantation hierarchy.⁴⁸ Perhaps, they sensed discrimination. It appeared that the part-Hawaiians

and Portuguese were the only people promoted to lower management and skilled jobs.⁴⁹ Discontented with the low wages, harsh circumstances and severe working conditions the Chinese eventually left the plantation to become rice planters, banana farmers, and vegetable growers, engaging in occupations more related to their agrarian background. They brought seeds from China to produce Chinese peas, long beans, water chestnuts, etc.⁵⁰

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: EMPLOYMENT IN RURAL OCCUPATIONS

In 1884, approximately 13,200 Chinese were employed in rural occupations. Between 1890 and 1896, four out of five Chinese males were engaged in Hawaii's rural resources. From 1910 to 1930, the number decreased. By 1930, only about one-fourth of the total Chinese male population were employed in some type of agricultural occupation.

CHINESE MEN ENGAGED IN RURAL OCCUPATIONS 1884-1930 Table 35			
Year	No. Males	No. Employees	Percent
1884	13,200	--	--
1890	10,400	13,067	80
1896	13,300	16,610	80
1910	7,216	13,742	53
1920	5,026	11,110	45
1930	2,143	8,571	25

Clarence Glick, *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese Migrants in Hawaii*, (Honolulu, Hawaii, University Press of Hawaii, 1980), 66.

Hawaii had no rigid racial, or ethnic barriers that restricted occupational movement.⁵¹ Chinese immigrants, entering at the bottom of the economic order as unskilled workers, could readily move upward in the various occupations available within the community.⁵² Those who did not become farmers, simply moved to Honolulu or other towns to find other types of occupation.

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY

Many Chinese eventually became skilled workers, artisans and small proprietors. Often they competed with the *haole*, the Hawaiians and other immigrant groups. Their occupations included laundrymen, domestic servants, barbers, food service workers and owners, participating in a variety of businesses.

After the turn of the century, the number of Hawaii-born Chinese males--the second generation--increased substantially. Starting in 1930, the employment trends for Chinese men shifted to the *preferred classes*. Fifty percent of the employed Chinese were engaged in professional, proprietary, clerical, and skilled forms of employment. This suggested that the Chinese had become more qualified and skilled. They possessed the necessary training and education to move into these areas of employment.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CHINESE MEN EMPLOYED IN HAWAII BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASS: 1890-1970									
Table 36									
Occu Class	1890	1896	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970
Prefer Classes	11.6	9.9	22.9	32.7	50.1	59.3	72.7	74.2	73.0
Professional	0.1	0.2	0.6	1.6	4.7	5.7	10.7	16.6	0.6
Proprietary	5.9	4.9	9.7	10.4	14.2	14.7	17.3	15.6	14.0
Clerical/Sales	1.3	1.8	5.4	11.5	20.7	28.7	26.2	21.3	17.9
Skilled	4.3	3.0	7.2	9.2	10.5	10.2	18.5	20.7	19.5
Other Classes	88.4	90.1	77.1	67.3	49.9	40.7	25.5	22.3	27.0
Farmer	11.6	12.7	9.2	4.4	4.3	1.6	1.0	0.9	0.4
Semiskilled	1.6	2.5	5.6	5.6	5.9	12.0	11.4	10.0	9.2
Dom. Serv	8.1	9.1	12.1	12.6	13.1	12.3	7.8	7.1	11.4
Unskilled	67.0	65.8	50.2	44.7	26.6	14.8	5.3	4.3	6.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	98.2b	96.5b	100
Males/Employ	13067	16610	13742	11110	8571	7853	8085	9866	13401
Males/Employ	13042	16550	3502	9885	5271	1600	900	NA	1650
Hawaii Born	25	60	240	1225	3300	6253	7185	NA	11750

Clarence Glick, *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese Migrants in Hawaii*, (Honolulu, Hawaii, University Press of Hawaii, 1980), 110.

In 1872, almost a century after Cook’s discovery of the Islands, the population of Caucasian males did not exceed 2,000 at anytime. As late as 1920, of a total population of 255,912, and with a total male population of 90,522 twenty-one years old and over, Caucasian males numbered about 8,500. Nearly 4,000 of the men were serving in military service quartered in Hawaii.⁵³ Glick states that in 1930, nine-thousand caucasians were gainfully employed, apart from those serving in the military.

Glick points out that although the caucasians dominated the financial and political facets of Hawaiian life, concerning population they were in the minority.⁵⁴ As the economy expanded the Caucasian segment of the population simply could not saturate the market. Many new job openings became available. This situation gave other ethnic groups the opportunity to fill these vacancies. It became possible for the Chinese, who were skilled labourers, to rise rapidly in the occupational scale.

The total of men and women of Chinese extraction in Hawaii's labour force in 1970 was 23,076. The Chinese had moved into a variety of occupational areas without much difficulty. In professional careers, where entrance was determined by a higher degree of educational or technical experience, the Chinese concentrated on three areas: (a) engineers or engineering and science technicians; (b) educators, both at college and pre college levels; and (c) professional health occupations--physicians, dentists, pharmacists, etc.⁵⁵ Betty Sung, in her labour research study, suggests that the Chinese far outnumbered other groups, such as whites, blacks and Japanese, in the professional fields.⁵⁶

Major Occupational Groups of the Chinese in Hawaii 1970				
Table 37				
	Males Employed		Females	
	Number	%	Number	%
	3,315		9,761	
Professional/Technical	2,883	21.7	1,860	19.1
Managers/Administrators	1,878	14.1	534	5.5
Sales Workers	866	6.5	890	9.1
Clerical Workers	1,499	11.3	3,619	37.1
Craftsmen	2,595	19.5	190	2.0
Operatives	1,229	9.2	778	8.0
Labourers	697	5.2	100	1.0
Farm Workers	146	1.1	54	0.6
Service Workers	1,516	11.4	1,650	16.9
Private Household Workers	6	0.1	86	0.9

Betty Lee Sung, *A Survey of Chinese-American Manpower and Employment* (New York, Praeger Publishers, 1976) 76.

The high degree of professional attainment of Chinese women should also be noted. When compared with the white and black labour force, more Oriental women (50 percent) work outside the home than blacks (48 percent) and whites (41

percent).⁵⁷ Sung suggests two reasons for the employment of Chinese women as follows: (a) females are postponing marriage until their late twenty's or early thirty's; and (b) women continue to work after marriage. On the second point, of the Chinese women employed, half are married, and one-third are mothers with children less than six.⁵⁸ Highly educated Chinese women are in the professional, technical fields (19.1 percent) and clerical fields (31.7 percent).

As noted from the occupations listed, high percentages of Chinese men and women entered the professional and technical occupations. A small number are farmers, unskilled labourers and private household workers. Without question, the economic position of the present Chinese has changed to the middle or upper-middle classes. This suggests a higher social status than their immigrant parents experienced. That generation was engaged as manual unskilled labourers.

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: ESTABLISHMENT OF CHINATOWN

Most of the Chinese who left the plantations moved to Honolulu and settled in an exclusively Chinese community. By 1866, the Chinese had concentrated in the area next to the Honolulu harbour, which became known as Chinatown.⁵⁹ In fact, Chinatown became the hub of their activities. They developed their associations, guilds and network of ethnic organisations to maintain their social and economic independence. Within the confines of Chinatown, the Chinese continued to maintain their language,⁶⁰ and their communal life that centered on relationships with their fellow compatriots. The main problems that drew the immigrants together were language barriers and lack of education. Many were illiterate. They needed someone to read and write letters for them.⁶¹ Between 1860-1900, most Chinese businesses were within the confines of Chinatown.⁶²

In Hawaii, unlike the Mainland U. S., Chinatown was established because of personal choice arising from the human needs for compatible company. In 1884, five thousand Chinese resided in Hawaii. Approximately 73 percent lived in Chinatown.⁶³ After a fire in 1886, followed by an outbreak of bubonic plague in the early 1900's, the community dispersed into other parts of Honolulu. By this time, the population of Chinatown was already in decline. Only 40 percent of the nine thousand Chinese living in Honolulu resided there. The Chinatown population declined from one thousand fifty-three in 1920, to eight hundred fifty-one in 1930.⁶⁴

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: MOVING FROM CHINATOWN

The Chinese community expanded into other geographical areas. These included areas that had been "carved-out" for other ethnic groups. This shows a gradual shift to a higher level of social and economic prosperity. Many Chinese moved into the Bingham Tract area, and established "homes on an American pattern to replace their former abodes in Chinatown."⁶⁵ As more prosperous Chinese moved to areas of higher prestige,⁶⁶ non-Chinese filled their places. The population in Bingham Tract became more cosmopolitan in character.

In 1930, 71.2 percent of the Chinese were raised in Honolulu,⁶⁷ suggesting a "substitution of a dispersion pattern for a segregation pattern . . ."⁶⁸ By 1950, 91.7 percent of the Chinese in Hawaii were urbanised.⁶⁹ According to the 1960 census, A. Lind states that, the Chinese had increased to the unparalleled high of 94.4 percent. They lived in all urban areas, including the areas next to Honolulu. This situation suggests that they were attracted by the opportunities of city life due to their strong commercial tradition.⁷⁰ In contrast, by 1960 less than three hundred lived in Chinatown. Lind concludes that ethnic groups integrate gradually into the community. The consequential decentralisation of the ethnic groups created a community where people no longer seriously took account of the racial ancestry of their neighbours.⁷¹

Within a period of approximately eighty years, the Chinese community had dispersed throughout much of Honolulu. This movement characterised another facet of structural assimilation. It underscored the necessity of economic power to move into the circles of exclusive membership in the cliques, clubs, etc. of the *Caucasian* community. The Chinese could now move to the fashionable areas where the Caucasians resided. Other ethnic groups, due to their economic and social success, also moved into these areas where racial extraction and cultural differences were no longer objectionable.

STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION: HAWAIIAN GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

The large influx of Chinese immigrants became a political issue for the planters, government officials and local labourers. Chinese labour in the Islands received mixed reactions. Some factions, in the community, were against the use of Chinese labour. The government soon became aware, then concerned, by the attitude of the Chinese toward mixed marriages. They realised that the Chinese coolie had "no

affinities, attractions or tendencies to blend with the Hawaiian " a situation that alarmed many politicians.⁷² Some politicians were agitated about the inroads the Chinese were making in business. Others were concerned and distressed about the exodus of Chinese labour from the plantations. Those concerned with Chinese coolie issues debated them at all levels.

In 1881, King Kalaukaua and the Commissioner of Immigration visited China in an attempt to reconcile the problem of Chinese immigration.⁷³ They conferred with Viceroy Li Hung-Chang in Tientsin and requested that he stop the continuance of immigration of Chinese men unless they were accompanied by their wives.⁷⁴ This request went unheeded by the Chinese government, who continued to send whoever showed an interest in emigrating.

Since the problem remained unresolved, the Hawaiian government, through the legislature, continued to pursue the problem of Chinese immigration. In 1888 the legislature introduced an amendment that prohibited and restricted the number of agricultural labourers from China. It shortened the stay for nonresidents. It also encouraged the planters, by recruiting other ethnic groups, to lessen the Chinese domination on the plantation.⁷⁵ The crux of the amendment restricted Chinese immigration, limited their employment, limited the purchase of land, and restricted their residence in Hawaii.⁷⁶ The proposed amendment was extremely controversial. Legislators suggested several modifications. After discussion in several committees the matter received an indefinite postponement. Agreeing on the terms of the amendment was impossible.⁷⁷

Members of the legislature continued to pursue the matter. In 1890 the Reform Party stated that Asiatic immigration was to be centred on agricultural needs, prohibiting Chinese employment in mechanical occupations.⁷⁸ In the same year, another bill was introduced to amend Article forty-seven of the Constitution, and was later referred to a committee for revision. On 29 November 1892 this revision became part of the Constitution.⁷⁹ In addition the legislature passed other laws to control and identify persons of any class or nationality who arrived in Hawaii. They could restrict and limit the term of residence and the business or employment of these immigrants.⁸⁰

Finally, with the annexation of Hawaii by the United States in 1898, more severe restrictions were imposed. The Chinese Exclusion laws enacted by the United States government, also applied to the Territory of Hawaii. This limited the number of

immigrant Chinese. In 1906, one hundred six immigrants arrived in Hawaii. By 1940, the Chinese population remained between twenty-one thousand and twenty-nine thousand, suggesting that these laws had severely restricted the growth of Hawaii's Chinese community.

MARITAL ASSIMILATION

The history of Chinese immigration into Hawaii is distinct from that into Britain. Confronting the Hawaiian government, more than one hundred years before their Statehood, were two major problems: the decline of the Hawaiian population and the depletion of plantation labourers. These situations expedited the recruitment of Chinese and other ethnic groups to replenish the sagging labour force on the plantations, and to intermarry with the declining Hawaiian population.

R. Adams suggests that mixed marriages are dependent on inequality of sex ratios and differences in language, religion, family customs and traditions, economic, social and educational status. Variances in racial and physical characteristics such as colour, features, etc., do not seem to play as important a role as do the cultural disparities.⁸¹

Interracial marriage was common. The Hawaiians had practised intermarriages from time immemorial.⁸² In a multiethnic Hawaiian society, racial and ethnic barriers were less rigid than on the United States Mainland. Chinese men did not hesitate to intermarry with the local women when Chinese women were unavailable.⁸³ This attitude continued to prevail in Hawaii. When the native Hawaiian race was in fear of extinction, intermarriage, as a solution, was accepted with little opposition. The Hawaiian women "showed no repugnance to marriage with the Chinese men."⁸⁴ They were considered reliable husbands by the Hawaiian women.⁸⁵

Adam's study shows that before 1900 an estimated one thousand two hundred to one thousand five-hundred Chinese married or lived with Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian women⁸⁶. According to the 1896 Census thirteen thousand eight hundred Chinese men were single. Four thousand twenty-seven were married, and only a few hundred Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian women had intermarried.⁸⁷ The statistics suggests that most Chinese either preferred single life, or had left Chinese wives in China, or anticipated marrying a Chinese woman in the future.⁸⁸

As time passed, the total number of interracial marriages in Hawaii increased

from 13 percent in 1913, to 32 percent in 1932. Differences also occurred in the attitude towards intermarriage between the Chinese men and the Chinese women. Chinese women were fewer as compared with Chinese men. Of the sixty-six Chinese women married between 1912-1913, only four had intermarried (6 percent) whereas fifty-nine (49 percent) of the one hundred twenty-one Chinese men had intermarried.⁸⁹ In 1930, 16,561 Chinese men lived in Hawaii as compared with 10,618 women. In the following year (1931-1932), of the one hundred seventy-three Chinese women married, forty-one intermarried (24 percent) showing an increase since 1912. For the same years, mixed-marriages changed for Chinese men. Of the one hundred seventy-two Chinese men married, only forty or 23 percent intermarried.⁹⁰ Declining numbers of bachelor immigrants and the increase in the number of Chinese families subsequently reduced the percentage of marriages between Chinese men and non-Chinese women. Five hundred seventy Chinese children were born to six hundred seventy-one Chinese families.⁹¹

As endogamous marriages became more common, after 1900, the size of the family unit also increased. Glick states that between 1870 and 1910, there were several Chinese children between the ages of six and fifteen years, whose numbers had multiplied from not more than a dozen or so, to more than three thousand five hundred.⁹²

The Chinese favoured endogamous marriages. Those who remained in the islands were unable to find Chinese women because of the preponderance of Chinese men in the population. Some of them returned to China to marry, or to be reunited with their families, while others married native Hawaiians. Early marriages between Chinese men and Hawaiian women were due to the lack of marriageable Chinese women, but the trend reversed as more marriageable women became available. This attitude toward endogamous marriages and the decrease in the number of mixed-marriages supports the supposition that Chinese men and women prefer to marry members of their ethnic group. As a result, the Chinese in Hawaii have not lost their ethnic identity through marital assimilation.

CONCLUSION

The Hawaii experience is unusual since the government endeavoured to resolve their two major problems through the recruitment of ethnic groups. Unlike other

nations, the government encouraged immigration to resolve their national dilemmas. They attempted to strengthen their declining population and to increase the number of labourers on the plantations. Disillusioned, the Chinese eventually left the plantations, slowly moving into the mainstream of the Hawaiian community.

For the first generation Chinese, all three of the assimilation factors, cultural, structural and marital, did not occur. The retention of their Chinese values and traditions was augmented by their predisposition to congregate in Chinatown. Their lack of skills and education consigned them to menial occupations, and prevented them from any upward mobility within the larger society. Their children, the second and succeeding generations however, through their educational attainment, found employment in all parts of the economy, particularly in the professional fields. This generation was culturally assimilated.

The value of education in the assimilation process cannot be minimised. As confirmed by the Chinese in Hawaii, educational attainment contributes two major functions during assimilation. First, educational institutions teach the traditional values (cultural assimilation) of the core society. Second, educational training prepares individuals to enter professions (structural assimilation), where economic, social and possibly, political power can be achieved.

Structural assimilation, for the Hawaii Chinese, was influenced by their education attainment. They moved into the cliques, clans and intimate levels of the Hawaiian society. Not only did they become prominent lawyers, doctors, politicians, etc. but they moved into geographical areas settled by the dominant core group. They elevated their³⁶ social, political and economic status without giving up their physical identity as Chinese.

Although intermarriage was common between the Chinese and other ethnic groups in Hawaii, it was not their first choice, but an outcome of their situation. As the number of Chinese men and women increased, the number of intermarriages decreased--endogamous marriages were favoured. Large-scale intermarriages did not happen, and the Chinese did not lose their physical characteristics, a condition that Gordon believes must happen to those who are structurally assimilated. Consequently, structural assimilation had little impact on intermarriage. For the Chinese, educational attainment made structural assimilation possible.

Finally, Hawaii may be atypical of other countries receiving immigrants. It

should be underscored that the Hawaiian society developed into a multicultural country. Even the native Hawaiian became a minority within their own nation. Although the *Caucasian* was also a minority, they dominated and controlled Hawaii's economy. Many ethnic groups came to Hawaii in large numbers. Each became a minority, and infused their cultural traditions into the existing culture. Blending the attitudes of each group highlighted their efforts to live together, bringing tolerance and acceptance of each others traditions, based on, and synthesised with dominant American values.

The final chapter will assess and compare the problems of education in terms of their relationship with cultural, structural and marital assimilation. In addition, recommendations will be made for future research of the Chinese community in Britain.

CHAPTER XI

ASSESSMENT AND COMPARISON

Educational indicators have directed and affected the assimilation model. Education profoundly affects cultural and structural assimilation. In this thesis, educational variables are linked to assimilative indicators and determined whether a minority group fully participates in the core society. Educational preparation is needed for the social, political, and economic realities of the immigrant group. Successful educational attainment, which is necessary to bridge cultural assimilation, must be examined and promoted to encourage social mobility for the immigrant.

The Chinese are members of multiple cultures, i.e., gender, age, religion, occupational status, socioeconomic status and family backgrounds. Consequently, their participation in society is influenced by their culture, beliefs, perceptions and behaviours. The model does not suggest nor promote complete assimilation but merely serves as an instrument that identifies where cultural, structural and marital assimilation have or have not occurred, especially in societies where cultural pluralism is encouraged. The pragmatic use of historical sources complements the model. It isolates certain components that focus on the problem. Using educational and historical evidence, provides answers to problems encountered by the Chinese.

The problem of assimilation is constant and complex. This study has examined the Chinese communities in Hawaii and Great Britain focussing on education's influence on cultural, structural and marital assimilation of the Chinese in Hawaii and the British Chinese living in three historic periods: 1784-1900, 1901-1950, and 1951-1985. The following sections will compare and assess the experiences of the Chinese living in Hawaii and Great Britain.

Assessment and Comparison of the Problem

This section compares the British and Hawaii experience using the assimilative indicators. Cultural assimilation, the first indicator, is defined as the acquisition of the intrinsic and extrinsic cultural and behavioural patterns of the core society. It is the acquisition of language; the acceptance of religious beliefs; the educational training and attainment; and the acceptance of the core society's traditions that indicate the extent of

cultural assimilation. Conflicting indicators that oppose cultural assimilation are the development of mother-tongue education, the maintenance of traditional beliefs, and alternative or parochial education.

The second indicator is structural assimilation. It is directly influenced by educational preparation and accomplishment. This suggests that the immigrant are employed in a diversity of occupations, working side-by-side with members of the core society on a primary group basis equivalent to their educational attainment. They live within the larger society rather than ethnically-enclosed and segregated neighbourhoods.

The third indicator occurs when structural assimilation or primary relationships are developed to a high degree. This situation will lead to large-scale intermarriages where the immigrant group will be totally absorbed into the core society, and eventually lose their physical identity. These three variables and indicators will be examined in light of the assimilation model.

BRITAIN AND HAWAII: COMPARISON OF CULTURAL ASSIMILATION

Cultural assimilation is practically nonexistent for the immigrant generation. They usually speak their own native language, practice traditional customs, and confine their activities within their own ethnic community. The second and succeeding generations, exposed to the core society's educational system and speaking English as their native tongue are culturally assimilated. The comparison of the British and Hawaii Chinese population focussed on four factors: (1) the acquisition of the English language, (2) the entrance into the education system, (3) the diametrical preservation of culture through mother-tongue education and (4) the sending of children back to China in order to maintain traditional customs and values. Antithetically, indicators opposing cultural assimilation are: (1) the development of mother-tongue education, (2) the maintenance of traditional beliefs, (3) an alternative education to the core society's educational system, and (4) the maintenance of cultural traditions. Underscoring these indicators is the response or lack of response to cultural assimilation by the core society. The initial arrival of the Chinese in both countries will be examined in light of immigration, settlement, and employment.

Background Comparison

The Chinese arrived in Hawaii as early as 1776. They worked on the sailing vessels that traded in Hawaiian ports. In the 1850s, they were contracted as indentured labourers to work on the sugar and pineapple plantations. They were hard-workers, and cheaply paid. Some Chinese and native Hawaiian intermarried. As the numbers of marriageable Chinese increased endogamous marriages became more common.

The Hawaiian society became an ideal setting for the blending of many races. In addition to the Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, Koreans, Filipinos, and other ethnic minorities were recruited to work on the plantations. The *haole* who came as missionaries and entrepreneurs dominated the island economy. These diverse cultures, however, influenced the establishment of a multicultural country.

After Hawaii's annexation in 1898, the United States dominated and extended its influence on the Hawaiian society. The American educational system became the foundation for cultural assimilation of the Hawaiian community. Each immigrant group, through compulsory education, learned the intrinsic and extrinsic cultural values of America, and the English language which unified the group as a whole.

In Britain, the Chinese came as seamen hired by the government and private shipping companies. Temporary housing, food, clothing and medical allowances were extended to the seamen until they could secure passage on a vessel returning to their homeland. Some seamen, discontent with their work, jumped-ship or terminated their employment to seek better employment onshore.

Employment, whether on sailing vessels or onshore, influenced the Chinese to remain in Britain. After World War II, large numbers of Chinese emigrated to Britain because jobs were plentiful. The majority became caterers or laboured in some aspects of that occupation. They were attracted to the restaurant industry because it did not compete with the British restaurants. More important, a command of the English language was unessential.

After 1950, an influx of Chinese immigrants from Hong Kong came to Britain. They emigrated to a welfare state. Particularly in the 1980's, with high unemployment, access to and participation in welfare programmes was challenging. These hurdles were much less clear in earlier times. As a result they were unable to use the system and prescribed programmes. Perhaps more important, ethnic diversity became a

significant benefit in a way that has never previously been the case in Britain. While this has eased some aspects of assimilation, it undoubtedly exacerbated some problems. Government agencies made an effort to improve assimilation through their services. But this new attitude may have raised parental aspirations over cultural and language maintenance and made cultural assimilation more difficult. Passage of restrictive immigration laws in the 1960's caused many Chinese labourers to prematurely bring their families to Britain, before they were financially prepared to support them.

The Chinese emigration in each country was based on employment. For many years, the Chinese emigrated from many countries to seek employment. Famine, revolution, turmoil and other factors drove the Chinese to seek a better way of life. In each instance it was the core society that determined how the Chinese would be integrated. The British society was basically homogeneous while Hawaii was composed of many diverse cultures. As the early immigrants arrived, many refused to give up their native language. They associated with their own ethnic groups and continued to speak Chinese. In Hawaii, the diversity of many races encouraged the development of "pigeon English" which was a mixture of various languages which fostered interaction, although limited, with other races.

Comparison of English Language Acquisition

The Chinese spoke Chinese. They were not required to speak English or the Hawaiian language, nor required to attend school. They learned English "on the job." As Hawaii became a United States territory in 1898, English became the predominant language. Their deficiency in the use of English did not hinder assimilation because other ethnic minorities were in the same situation. The mixing of these immigrant groups developed a unique form of "pigeon-English" which became an informal communication medium for the members of the Hawaiian society. This language was a composite of English, Hawaiian and other ethnic languages. With the birth of the second generation in Hawaii, English became their primary language because of their entrance into the educational system. Instruction was in English, and therefore, it became their primary language.

The Chinese entering Britain as early as 1782 were unconcerned about the acquisition of the English language. Most were content to speak Chinese. They were not required to gain an education, but were eventually required to know English. Many

acquired enough English to pass the language test implemented by the shipping companies in the early 1900s. Those who married English women were forced to speak English more frequently to their wives and children. They developed their own brand of "pigeon-English" which was enough to communicate with their immediate family members.

The majority of the children born prior to 1950, primarily in the 1920s and 1930s, came from mixed marriages. Children born to mixed-couples spoke English as their first language, and through compulsory education, were required to formalise their education. Communication with their English mother enhanced their English language acquisition.

Chinese emigrating to Britain after 1950 spoke only Chinese. English acquisition was unnecessary because most Chinese were employed in the catering industry where contact with the British was limited. Their difficulty was compounded with the China-born children who entered the British school system with limited English language competence to understand the lessons prepared for them.

By the 1980's there were 24,000 British-born Chinese of an estimated 91,000 Chinese population. Most of these children were educated at an earlier age, and grew up learning English and British culture and traditions which were taught at school. It is this generation of children who will have an advantage to be structurally assimilated into the British society.

The fundamental aspect of cultural assimilation lies in the acquisition of the English language. Clearly from this study of the first generation and newly arrived Chinese in Britain, but they did not acquire English as their second language. Countless examples have been cited to show the vast problems that arose from not using or knowing English, especially for the newly arriving immigrants. The second generation and those born in Britain, however, have fewer problems because they are beginning to acquire English as their first language as a result of compulsory education.

Education was not a factor for the early Chinese. It was not until the birth of the second generation that educational training became a factor in their cultural and structural assimilation. In every case, the educational system was different yet the most important influence for change.

Comparison of Educational Factors

The early missionaries in Hawaii developed three types of schools: (1) the boarding school; (2) training schools; and (3) common schools. The boarding school was reserved for those who could afford to pay for this privilege. These were usually the children of the *haole* missionary or wealthy plantation owners. The training schools and common schools accommodated children of other groups, primarily the Hawaiian population. Compulsory education, established after 1898, opened educational opportunities for all groups. Through the public school system the children were taught the social and governmental ideals of the American community.

The Chinese in Hawaii have a statistically high educational record, gradually increasing in their educational attainment. By 1970, a period of over one-hundred years since the first Chinese immigrants arrived in Hawaii, the median number of years completed by Chinese pupils was 12.4 years, only 4.2 percent lacked schooling. Twenty-eight percent of Chinese over the age of twenty-five attended colleges or universities while 18 percent completed four or more years. As a result, they have entered the technical and professional fields of employment.

The Chinese moved into the middle and upper-middle class structure of Hawaii, and became the community's business executives and professionals owning middle-sized businesses and large corporations. They also became doctors, lawyers, architects, engineers, scientists, clergymen, college professors and executives. The social class then develops its own network of characteristic organisations, institutional activities, and social cliques. The cultural attitude of the Chinese toward education, not only contributed to their high educational attainment, but also engineered their cultural and structural assimilation into the Hawaiian society.

The educational system offered equal opportunities for occupational and educational attainment. The second and succeeding generations of Chinese, through their educational achievement and economic prowess, were eventually assimilated into the Hawaiian society.

There are certain facts that remain evident in this study, and these are: (a) the children attended British schools; (b) most completed their basic education; (c) few received scholarships and (d) the children were a small minority in the predominately English schools.

Children of mixed marriages, those born to mixed-parentage during the period

of 1900-1950, were culturally assimilated into the British society. English was spoken at home. The British mothers accelerated their children's assimilation by instilling British traditions, culture and values. Cultural assimilation was a natural process. They went to school speaking English, and therefore, understood their lessons without much difficulty. The children considered themselves British!

The post-1950 children can be divided into two groups: British Born and non-British Born. A majority of children emigrated from Hong Kong or other countries. Few children were born in Britain, but later the numbers of British born Chinese children increased. British born children have fared better than those born elsewhere. The former attended infants, middle and secondary schools. Their use of English is better, and they have learned British cultural values and ethics through the educational system. Non-British born children faced many challenges and adjustments particularly with the use of the English language.

The cultural assimilation of the children emigrating to Britain has been slow. Language acquisition, integration into the school system, communication and a host of other problems plague the non-British-born Chinese children. As a result, most continue to speak their native language and lack a command of English. Education in British schools, encourages English usage and minor differences in pronouncing and inflecting English. Conflict between the two cultures arises because parents expect their children to uphold Chinese traditions and practices. The British government, however, supported and proposed to the local education authorities that English be a priority language for immigrant children.

Immigrant children exposed to the core society through the educational system, infuse and embrace the new culture within their lives often overshadowing their ethnic culture. Educational attainment also provides employment opportunities outside the traditional ethnic occupations and encourages the children to compete with members of the core society in a vast array of occupations. Cultural assimilation has occurred in varying degrees through the education of the second generation British-born Chinese and to a limited degree for non-British born Chinese who joined their parents during the 1960s.

Chinese cultural values were extremely important for the immigrant Chinese. Many required their children to learn their native tongue, practice their traditions, and remain Chinese. These attitudes prolonged cultural and structural assimilation, making

it difficult for the second generation to assimilate.

RESISTANCE TOWARDS CULTURAL ASSIMILATION

The Chinese continued to maintain their cultural values, traditions and primary relationships with members of their own ethnic group. They were determined to ignore the pressures exerted by the British by remaining ethnically enclosed in their community and limiting their relationships to other Chinese. Efforts to assimilate the Chinese were oftentimes deterred through the actions and reactions of the Chinese. The immigrants were concerned that their children were becoming assimilated into their respective cultures and losing their cultural identity. The natural course for the first generation was to develop means to maintain their traditions. The following sections will examine the particular obstacle that discouraged cultural assimilation.

Comparison of Mother Tongue Education

In 1911, two Chinese language schools were opened in Hawaii. The number increased to twenty-eight in a few years. Pupils attended in the evening and later on Saturdays. After 1918, a Hawaiian Government embraced the Americanise educational system. The government felt that learning another language was detrimental to learning English. The growth of the Japanese language schools alarmed the government, and legislation was passed to impede the growth of these schools. This legislation also affected the growth of Chinese language schools. By the end of World War II, there was a significant reduction in the number of these schools.

In the 1920s and 1930s the Chinese in Britain attempted to provide mother-tongue education to Chinese pupils. There were about 40 children and 50 adults registered for the courses. Children in Limehouse were taught their "heritage" besides Chinese. There was little impact these schools had on the children of the Chinese seamen. Since most of them were born to mixed-couples, the influence of the British mother had an impact on the lives of the children. Their first language was English and the learning of Chinese was merely an attempt to understand their father's culture.

After 1950 the numbers of language schools mushroomed. By 1981 there were sixty language classes with approximately 6,700 Chinese children in attendance. The issued directive by the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1976 supported the teaching of the mother-tongue and culture. Yet, the language school still continued to

influence the lives of the younger generation. From the research conducted at the Kung Ho School, it showed that the numbers of children decreased as they grew older. Perhaps, this trend indicated that the older the children felt compelled to concentrate on their "O" level or GCE examinations.

In comparison, the Chinese in Britain found greater support for the learning of the mother tongue. Each country viewed the acquisition of the mother tongue from their perspective: the Hawaiian government believed that the mother tongue was an obstacle towards cultural assimilation, while the British government encouraged mother tongue education through financial support. This attitude supported cultural pluralism, and encouraged the maintenance of traditional customs and values. Yet, in some cases the Chinese community in each country attempted to decrease the influence of cultural assimilation by sending their children back to China. Usually the oldest son or other siblings were sent back to China to be educated. Parents believed that it was for the best interest of the children.

Comparison of Sending Children to China

The Chinese in Hawaii sent their children by sending children back to China for their formal education. Large numbers of children, particularly boys were sent back to China. The oldest son was usually selected to return for his education and to find a wife. Later, they returned to Hawaii.

The practice of sending children to China to live with grandparents or family members attempted to do the following: (1) reduce or even suppress the effects of cultural assimilation, (2) relieve the economic pressures of the family, (3) to learn and maintain their own culture, (4) parents worked such long hours that they could not give adequate care to their children.

Chinese children in Britain were sent back to China for similar reasons previously mentioned. When they returned to Britain, they seriously lacked English skills. Children who were raised by grandparents, and then reunited with their parent in Britain were often unable to recognise them. Now, much older, the children realised that it was more difficult to learn English. Though parents acted with good intentions, the children who, after spending several years in Hong Kong, were severely hindered.

Conclusion

The educational history of public schools in Hawaii shows how cultural and educational policies have affected the education of minority groups. These policies have prevailed to assimilate all immigrants, including the native Hawaiian, into the American mainstream culture, and into the American system of education. Cultural assimilation through the educational process became a priority for the Hawaiian as well as the United States governments. Compulsory education, highlighting English language and literacy development, mastery of academic content and skill, and to a degree, access to post secondary opportunities, became the basis towards Americanisation. The Chinese took advantage of educational opportunities, and were culturally assimilated.

Meanwhile, the Chinese children in Britain were expected to attend school, and were afforded the same opportunities as their British hosts. Again, the educational institution became the hub for cultural assimilation where the language, cultural and moral traditions were taught. However, newly arrived children, those who had lived in Britain for a short time or had been primarily educated in Chinese, had difficulty communicating ideas and feelings, often confused, frustrated, angered, and alienated. These children must balance the value systems of their native culture, ever present at home, with those of the core culture, which prevail at school.

The Chinese children must be able to make a smooth transition into and beyond secondary schools. They must be willing to function as communities, bridging gaps with the mainstream British society, as well as the culture of the school. Their acquisition of English language abilities and academic skills, accompanied by a support of mother-tongue education, can provide a foundation for the future success of Chinese pupils in the educational setting. Immigrant children must learn to read, write, understand, and speak English; develop academic literacy in English to make the transition to the labour force or into other educational programmes; and become socialised into British society during adolescence, a time of major emotional, physical, and psychological change. Through education, successful employment and settlement can become a reality. As these children are accepted in the mainstream of the British society, they will eventually find employment outside the traditional catering industry.

BRITAIN AND HAWAII: STRUCTURAL ASSIMILATION

Structural assimilation has been evaluated through employment and settlement, home or property ownership. It can be profoundly affected by educational attainment. Without the necessary credentials, skills or educational attainment, entrance into the core society's primary groups is almost impossible. Structural assimilation indicates that a minority group entering the cliques, clubs and institutions of the core society at the primary group level intermarries in substantial numbers.

A further indication of structural assimilation is spacial mobility. Spatial mobility is the movement of ethnic minorities from established racial or ethnic neighbourhoods into areas inhabited primarily by the members of the core society. Ethnic minorities change their location of residence due to changes in education, which affect income and occupational status. The following sections will examine and compare structural assimilation in Hawaii and Great Britain according to the variables mentioned above.

Comparison of Structural Assimilation Indicators

In theory the indicators of structural assimilation are as follows: (1) employment or occupation; (2) admittance into the clubs, cliques, etc.; and (3) spatial mobility, the process by which a group attains residential proximity to members of the host society and move from established racial or ethnic neighbourhoods into a larger urban environment inhabited primarily by the white population. On the contrary, indicators negating structural assimilation are: (1) remaining in ethnic occupations; (2) enclosure with ethnic organisations, social interaction primarily with members of their own ethnic group; and (3) lack of home ownership or spatial mobility. Also, included in these categories are the responses of the British and ethnic communities. These indicators include legislative mandates, discrimination, biases of the British society, ethnic seclusion or isolation in any form. While this may not be the most appropriate measure for all immigrant groups, adopting this rationale can identify the deeply held beliefs of both the Chinese who came to Britain and the members of the British public who received them.

The effects of education are far reaching. It influences the type of occupation the Chinese entered and the development of primary relationships. Education, for the

first generation Chinese, had no bearing on structural assimilation. Many had limited or no educational training. They were unskilled but relied heavily on determination and hard work. Most entered labour intensive occupations that encouraged long hours and time away from their families.

Initial Chinese immigration into Britain and Hawaii occurred within a single occupational category. The Chinese in Britain were seamen, then caterers after 1945. In Hawaii they were indentured labourers. The diversity or lack of diversity of employment, therefore, will prove or disprove a measure of structural assimilation. Their settlement or place of residence can denote the degree to which they were received into the general civic life of the core community.

Comparison of Settlement

The Chinese left the plantations, moved to Honolulu, and established a Chinatown. By 1866, the Chinese had concentrated in the area next to the Honolulu harbour. Chinatown became the hub of their activities. By 1884, more than 70 percent of the Chinese population resided in Chinatown. Between 1920 and 1930, the Chinatown population declined. In Hawaii, the Chinese community had moved into other geographical areas. Within a period of approximately eighty years, the Chinese moved from Chinatown and relocated into the fashionable areas where the Caucasians resided. As they became more economically prosperous as a result of educational attainment, they moved into urbanised areas.

The Chinese seamen who arrived as early as 1782 resided in Liverpool, London and other British port cities. Housing, provided by the Company, encouraged isolation from the British society. They were housed in barracks or occasionally, in boarding houses with other foreign seamen. Eventually, the Company rescinded their responsibility to house the seamen. Next, the Chinese moved into the neighbourhoods close to the docklands.

Those who lived in London settled in Limehouse Causeway and Pennyfield. In the 1860's through the 1870's, the Chinese community, mainly seamen, lived on one street--Limehouse Causeway. The Liverpool Chinese community settled around Pitt Street, Cleveland Square and Frederick Street.

Chinatown was established probably in the 1860s or 1870s. Its evolution was spontaneous and became a place for the Chinese to preserve their own cultural traditions and beliefs. It also was a buffer and sanctuary against the British community.

Here they could eat their foods, gamble, smoke opium, find lodging, mingle with their own people, and develop businesses.

Most properties leased from British landlords were used for residences or businesses. The lack of Chinese property ownership may indicate that the Chinese did not have enough capital to purchase property, and that their ventures were purely economic. After 1950, the original Chinese community in Limehouse was scattered throughout the country. Immigrant parents died, leaving the second generation to continue as British. A new wave of Chinese, mostly from Hong Kong, emigrated to Britain, again facing the same difficulties of the pre-1950 Chinese. They lived in Council housing or were accommodated in company housing by employers in the restaurant industry.

Settlement or housing facilities culturally enclosed the Chinese and provided them with a safe-haven from the British society. In terms of structural assimilation, the Chinese limited their activities within their ethnic group. They were enclosed within their own community and did not need to accept the culture of the British society by entering their cliques or clubs.

The present community in Britain is dispersed primarily because of employment. Some Chinese are employed in Chinatown but most families have take-aways that are found within the core community. They are close-knit, with very little association outside their business because their long working hours limit their opportunity for relationships with the core community.

Large numbers of Chinese, whether first, second or even third generation, have not entered the cliques or clubs of the British society. The British class structure is such that entrance into the most exclusive cliques is determined by class. Their chances to move into the British higher classes are as impossible for them as it is for the lower class British.

Three factors prevent Chinese settlement within the British society. First, most Chinese are severely disadvantaged in English language communication, spoken and written. Second, most are unwilling to establish primary relationships with members of the British society. Third, their employment hampers any possibility of learning to use English because of their long working hours. They choose to remain ethnically enclosed preferring to maintain their culture within the context of their family and ethnic community. Whether they live, in areas of predominantly British citizens or in

concentrated pockets with other Chinese, has little influence on structural assimilation. It is also evident, as experienced by other immigrant groups, that mobility to other parts of the community with members of the British community, depends on economics--the ability to purchase homes, etc. Such mobility is based on employment and finances.

Comparison of Employment

Formal education did not influence in occupational mobility during the early years for the first generation Chinese. Many developed their skills from their own "hands-on" experience. Mainly, they held labourious positions, not professional or technical fields. There were no rigid racial or ethnic barriers to restrict occupational movement in Hawaii. The Chinese who contracted to work in Hawaii were usually uneducated and generally came from lower income or social classes within their own country. The Hawaiian government enlisted Chinese contract labourers for work on the plantations. Initially they were involved in rural occupations. The Chinese immigrants entering at the bottom of the economic order as unskilled workers, could readily move upward in the various occupations available within the community. The Chinese left the plantation to become rice planters, banana farmers, and vegetable growers. The Chinese labourers, who did not become farmers, simply moved to Honolulu or other towns.

Many Chinese became skilled workers, artisans and small proprietors. They became laundrymen, domestic servants, barbers, food service workers and owners, participating in a variety of businesses. The second generation Hawaii-born Chinese males increased during the 1900s. Due to their educational attainment, after 1930, 50 percent of the employed Chinese were engaged in professional, proprietary, clerical, and skilled forms of employment. The Chinese moved into other occupational areas without much difficulty. In professional careers, where a higher degree of educational or technical experience determined entrance into a profession, the Chinese concentrated on three areas: (a) engineers or engineering and science technicians; (b) educators, both at college and pre-college levels; and © professional health occupations--physicians, dentists, pharmacists, etc. For the Chinese in Hawaii, the nature of the Hawaiian society promoted a mixing of various cultures, which were all minority groups, making it possible to establish a unique society of minorities. As a result, structural assimilation could be based on economic standing and position within diverse

occupations.

The East India Company made provisions to care for the Chinese reaching Britain. It was the intention of these companies to have the Chinese remain only temporarily. The Company provided employment for the seamen while onshore. Eventually the hiring policy changed and private shipping owners subsequently employed cheap native labour along with British seamen. This created the problem of foreign labour in the shipping industry. The Chinese decision to reside permanently compounded the issue as the British seamen viewed the Chinese as a permanent threat to their livelihood.

Initially, the Chinese seamen's population was negligible, but gradually increased by the end of the nineteenth century. The British government's employment policies did not single out anyone ethnic group. These policies were directed towards all foreign seamen, particularly those groups with large numbers employed on the merchant ships. The Chinese seamen's sole purpose for coming to Britain was employment.

Tension was always high in the docklands. The union constantly highlighted the Chinese employment issue. During the First World War (1914-1918) some Chinese were engaged in employment in the British munitions and aerodrome factories. After the War and continuing through the 1930s, the number of Chinese decreased. As employment waned, the union spent less time agitating for the elimination of Chinese labour

The Chinese established businesses, such as shops and boarding houses in a small geographical area to service their countrymen. A relatively small number of Chinese were involved in restaurants in Limehouse and other port cities. Some diversified into the laundry trade. By 1931, there were approximately 500 Chinese laundries throughout Britain. However, in the 1940s with the introduction of the washing machine, many laundries were closed.

After 1950, there were a few businessmen, professionals and student nurses. In the 1960s, Chinese employment focussed on a single occupational category--the restaurant business. In 1980 there were an estimated 4,000 restaurant outlets and take-aways throughout the country. By 1984, the numbers had increased to approximately 6,500 restaurants and take-away businesses. Approximately 95 percent of the British Chinese community was engaged in some aspect of the catering business. Within the

catering business there were 90 percent in the take-away food business.

As in the case of cultural assimilation, structural assimilation faced several obstacles. Laws were passed by the United States to limit and sometimes, prohibit immigration. These discriminatory laws fuelled racial discrimination and often regulated structural assimilation.

Resistance to Structural Assimilation

The United States government passed stringent laws prohibiting Chinese immigration. Ethnic-specific laws were passed by various states. These laws had limiting effects in Hawaii because of distance from the mainland United States and because of its strong multicultural society. The Chinese had occupations that were essential to the Hawaiian economy. Many were merchants, and later developed skills to fill other professional occupations. Hawaii was a melting-pot of many races. This situation only enhanced the economic and social positions of all ethnic groups.

There were many laws passed to control the influx of immigrants into Britain. The English language tests imposed upon the Chinese by the Board of Trades and a direct request of the Firemen's and Seamen's Union attempted to limit the number of Chinese working on the sailing vessels. The British seamen did not want cheap labourers taking away their jobs. As a result, the Chinese were not accepted in the cliques or clubs of the British seamen, and limited primary relationships developed with them.

After World War II, the Chinese community confined their occupational activities within the walls of their own community. Catering became their predominant occupation. In a sense, they had built their own division, separating themselves socially from the British society. Interaction was limited to work, and there were almost no primary relationships developed with the British.

Conclusion

In conclusion, education in the core society was nonexistent for the immigrant Chinese. Structural assimilation which is the significant ingredient of assimilation was not a factor for the early immigrant. Most were not highly educated even in their own country. When they arrived in Hawaii or Britain, they were confined in one or two occupations that did not conflict with the core society. Oftentimes they were excluded

from developing primary relationships with members of the core society. They also remained enclosed within their own community.

For the second generation, they were educated, learning English and the traditional values of the host society. The Hawaii Chinese used their educational opportunities to enter higher education and technical schools. The result of this education provided them the opportunity to enter the professional occupation, such as doctors, lawyers, educators, etc. For them education became the impetus toward structural assimilation. The British Chinese, on the other hand, had difficulty. Although they were educated, many returned to the traditional occupations of their parents—the catering industry. Education had not been a factor towards structural assimilation.

MARITAL ASSIMILATION

Marital assimilation, the final indicator of assimilation, will be discussed. It is a powerful indicator of total assimilation. However, it is limited, and is not wholly dependent on cultural, structural assimilation or influenced by the educational indicators. Intermarriage indicates social integration and primary relationships with the core society. Statistically when there are sufficient numbers of men or women, the choice to marry within their own ethnic group is greater. The following sections will compare and assess marital assimilation.

Comparison of Marriages

The Chinese favoured endogamous marriages. Some returned to China to marry Chinese women. Interracial marriage, however, was a common practice among the Hawaiians. The local Hawaiian women did not hesitate to marry the Chinese. They considered the Chinese men to be reliable husbands. The 1896 Census showed that a few hundred Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian women intermarried with other ethnic groups. Marriages between Chinese men and Hawaiian women were due to the lack of marriageable Chinese women. The trend changed as more marriageable women became available.

The pre-1900 Chinese records found a few Chinese intermarried to British women. Marriages were more difficult to assess because the names of both partners were necessary to determine the person he or she married. However, a brief perusal of

the marriage records was made for the years between 1895-1912. No Chinese names could be found. During the early part of the 1900s, few Chinese women lived in Britain. Primary relationships with British women were developed in the public areas frequented by the Chinese, primarily in the "pubs" and residential areas. One reason why the Chinese intermarried with British women was the unavailability of Chinese women which was similar to the Chinese in Hawaii.

Marital assimilation for the Chinese living in Britain was determined through marriage records at St. Catherine's House. Several weeks were spent in systematically extracting from more than one thousand volumes of marriage records, between 1912-1984, of Chinese marriages. British women who associated with Chinese men were also searched (for those after 1912) to find out whether they had married a Chinese. No searches were made for marriages of British women identified in various materials who married a Chinese. From these records, during the 1930s through the 1940s, the numbers of intermarriages decreased. After 1950, but particularly 1960, Chinese men who were working in Great Britain requested their families in China to join them, resulting in the decrease of intermarriages.

Conclusion

Educational indicators have limited influence on marital assimilation. Yet, primary relationships are developed where people meet, the cliques, clubs, schools, universities and institutions. Clearly when a minority groups are allowed to associate with the core society at all levels, intermarriages are more possible. From the study however, the Chinese tend to favour endogamous marriages, and a few may intermarry.

ASSESSMENT OF THE ASSIMILATION MODEL

The research thesis has focussed on the use of the model of assimilation to evaluate the cultural, structural and marital assimilation of the Chinese in Hawaii and Britain. This section will focus on the model's variables to determine whether they are reliable indicators of assimilation.

Assessment of Cultural Assimilation

Cultural assimilation is the first of the assimilative process to be accepted by the immigrant. It is extremely reliable for the study of assimilation. Cultural assimilation,

both intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics, become more prevalent in the second generation Chinese though intrinsic traits were more difficult to change.

The immigrant is less likely to accept the culture or language of the core society. Clearly, the research shows that the immigrant first is concerned about employment. He spends his time working to support a family. There is little time for education or to learn the language. The ethnic language is not abandoned nor cultural traditions. Rarely do primary relationships occur with members of the core society.

Without question, educational attainment is the key by which minorities move from one economic level to another. It is the vehicle of spacial and occupational mobility. Through these means, minorities will have a greater chance to experience structural assimilation. The children of immigrants are the most affected by cultural assimilation. They balance between worlds, but the influence of the core society is strong as a result of compulsory education. Through the attainment and fluency of English, the chance of cultural assimilation is more complete. The use of cultural assimilation is extremely practical as it defines a part of assimilation. Its definition provides a broad, yet specific, insight to examine the problem.

Assessment of Structural Assimilation

Structural assimilation is the keystone of the arch of assimilation. It is the immigrant's acceptance into the cliques and clubs of the host society where primary relationships are established. Throughout these relationships, ethnic barriers are negated in order to establish primary relationships that often lead to marriage. The significance of it is the disappearance of the ethnic group as a separate entity, and no longer identifiable or distinguishable as Chinese.

Structural assimilation variables must be used with caution. In essence, it cannot be separated from other variables. It must be directly linked to cultural assimilation. This study has shown that structural assimilation is enhanced through the educational and economic attainment of the immigrant. English language acquisition, acceptance of the British culture, and being British will magnify their opportunity to enter into the cliques and clubs of the British society. The result of better and higher educational qualifications made it possible for the Chinese in Hawaii to attain professional jobs, and in turn generate more income to relocate to areas where the core society lived. The foundation for structural assimilation is cultural assimilation,

particularly educational achievement. The potential for spacial and occupational mobility and earning power increased because of their educational attainment.

Although structural assimilation can enhance large scale intermarriages, this study has shown that the choice of a marriage partner is determined by the number of marriageable men or women from that ethnic group. Therefore, structural assimilation does not guarantee large-scale intermarriage but provides a possibility for such marriages.

Assessment of Marital Assimilation

The model suggests that there is a relationship between structural assimilation and marital assimilation. Discrimination is eliminated when the minority group is no longer distinguishable from members of the host society. In fact, the idea that entrance into the cliques and clubs of the core society will increase the number of intermarriages is not true for the Chinese. For them, the choice of endogamous marriages far outweighs intermarriages because they prefer to marry within the ethnic group. The research shows that endogamous marriages increased when more Chinese men or women were available to marry. Although structural assimilation may be an important component for intermarriage and the elimination of discrimination as the model suggests, this research has shown that there were few intermarriages as compared to the number of Chinese men living in Hawaii and Great Britain. When the number of marriageable Chinese men or women increased so did endogamous marriages.

Conclusion

The use of this model has focussed the research in areas where educational indicators have uncovered and clarified the process of assimilation as affected by education. It is obvious that the influence of education profoundly affects the assimilation of any immigrant group. The use of cultural, structural and marital assimilation has defined the areas of investigation. The specific definitions of each variable have made it easier to examine and clarify the problem. As a result, these variables have isolated the importance of the educational system on the lives of immigrants, particularly the second and succeeding generations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Finally, a word of optimism needs to be injected for future studies of the Chinese community. This study of the Chinese of pre-1950 Britain shows that the Chinese community, with the passing of the immigrant generation and the cultural assimilation of the second and succeeding generation appear to have had little problems in assimilating. The assimilation of the pre-1950 Chinese immigrants was negligible. Many continued to preserve their traditional values and customs. They limited the acceptance of various aspects of the British culture. They were minimally affected by cultural assimilation. Their children, raised and educated in Britain were considered British. They infused British values, often conflicting with their Chinese parent's cultural beliefs. Whether offspring of endogamous or interracial marriage, each was distinguishable by their Chinese features and frequently made to feel second-rate to their British peers. Despite these obstacles, the children, now adults, secured jobs, married and raised families. The British society had culturally assimilated them. Many intermarried, causing the disappearance of Chinese features in their offspring.

Cultural Assimilation

The basic goal of the core society and immigrant should centre on limited cultural assimilation. This places the emphasis on the acquisition of fundamental skills: the use of the English language (but not the abandonment of the mother-tongue); occupational training; orientation to standard technological devices; knowledge to use the educational and vocational resources; citizenship; and participation in the political process. They should be encouraged to worship in their ethnic church, to read newspapers published in the native tongue, to establish mutual aid societies, to establish a network of ethnically enclosed cliques and friendship patterns, and endogamous marriages in order for the ethnic minority to establish a cultural adjustment and a bridge to the core society. This situation will provide emotional, economic and ethnic stability.

An important factor in decreasing the impact of the core society's culture is the preservation of the native language. The preservation of language, culture and traditions and their instinctive need to retain communication with their children is important to the Chinese. In both countries, Hawaii and Britain, the Chinese developed language schools for their children.

The focus of cultural assimilation must be on the second and succeeding generation through their exposure to the educational system. They must be identified and prepared to accept the values of the core society. After all, it is within this context that they will need to live. Education is integral to cultural assimilation. The educational institutions reinforce the traditions and values of the core society.

Structural Assimilation

Structural assimilation of immigrants who enter the country in substantial numbers enough to establish a community of their own is almost an impossible attainment and undesirable goal. It would bring undue pressure on the immigrant and core society. Naturally, most newcomers will need and prefer the security of a communal life made up of their fellow immigrants from their homeland. To force structural assimilation on the immigrant would be futile and impossible. This has been clearly illustrated by the Chinese entering Britain in the two periods already mentioned. Their sociological, psychological and economic needs were found within the boundary of their own group. Even those few individuals who were structurally assimilated could profitably use the communal base of their own group to adjust into the British society.

Structural separation (primary group contacts between various ethnic groups held to a minimum) has been the primary attitude of both the British and Chinese for many years. Chinese living in Hawaii were assimilated, but not Great Britain. Perhaps one explanation why is because their community has not had enough time to evolve. When the second or succeeding generation is successful in their educational pursuit, larger numbers will be absorbed into the full spectrum of occupations of the British society. The recent change in attitude by the British government has been to allow the Chinese to live without much government interference. Consequently, the sudden change, may take years before full implementation occurs and trust between both groups has developed.

Marital Assimilation

Marital assimilation should not be a goal of assimilation. It will not occur on a large scale, at least for the Chinese, as exemplified by this study of the Chinese living in Hawaii and Great Britain. Endogamous marriages were practised and preferred when there were large numbers of marriageable men and women from the same ethnic

group. Exceptions will arise as illustrated by the Chinese who lived in Limehouse during the 1920s and 1930s. The community was small and mostly consisted of intermarried couples. For these Chinese seamen, their choice was to either intermarry, return to China, or remain single.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

The educational attainment of the Chinese should be considered and studied in the future. Education will bridge cultural and structural assimilation with that of the core society. Education will play a major role as the Chinese enters all the aspects of British life. As they gain more qualifications, degrees, and experience, the next generation of Chinese will have an opportunity of leaving their parent's traditional occupations. As a result, many will have an opportunity to enter all types of occupations, that will propel them towards spatial mobility.

Proponents of multiculturalism want the identity of the immigrant to be maintained. Even mutual assimilation, accommodation and acculturation are questioned. The melting pot, once enthusiastically embraced, is now criticised. As the world becomes more of a global community, interrelationships between countries and peoples must become a priority. Multiculturalism and diversity in the educational setting must be addressed to insure a smooth transition for all minority groups. Each individual does not live in a vacuum within his or her own culture, and knowledge of other cultures is not only important but necessary. The goal of education must be to help all students develop more positive attitudes toward different cultural, racial, ethnic, and religious groups.

The most significant attempt by the British government to recognise the Chinese community and its problems have been the formation of the Home Affairs Committee in 1984. Evidence was invited from a large section of the Chinese community. Visits were made to a number of areas throughout Britain where substantial Chinese population lived and worked. Members of the committee also visited Hong Kong. This extensive research and inquiry have established many recommendations that have been referred to in this and previous Chapters.

The Home Affairs Committee has highlighted the problems faced by the Chinese and has demonstrated the concerns of the British government. The role of local authorities and government departments have previously been questioned. They have

been challenged to provide improved opportunities concerning English as a second language, education, urban programmes, mother-tongue teaching, employment careers, social security, social services, health services, housing, immigration and nationality. Despite the committee's findings, their recommendations are only suggestions and only time will tell whether the agencies responsible for these services can integrate the Chinese into the British society. Therefore, it is recommended that training, retaining and occupational changes be granted the Chinese so that they are not dependent, or entirely reliant on the catering industry. Governmental agencies must be required to teach English as a second language and provide realistic programmes to include minorities unable to adequately speak English.

The lack of detailed information on the Chinese community, particularly their educational and occupational advances, has been drastically missing for this study. Researchers need to allocate time and finances to extract information necessary to monitor their progress.

Finally, the importance of education cannot be understated. It is through education that cultural and structural assimilation of the Chinese will be completed. How these recommendations are implemented will depend on the attitudes of local government. They must deal specifically with the problems of the Chinese who are living in their geographical jurisdiction. Future research will be necessary to evaluate the recommendations and responses of the government to assimilating the Chinese into the British society.

CHAPTER I

ENDNOTES

1. The Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups, *Education for All*, Chairman: Lord Swann FRSE, (London, HMSO, 1985), 7.
2. Glen Grant and Dennis M. Ogawa, "Living Proof: Is Hawaii the Answer?" *American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530 (Nov 1993), 137.
3. Won Moo Hurh and Kwang Chung Kim, "The 'Success' Image of Asian Americans: Its Validity, and Its Practical and Theoretical Implications," in Christopher G. Ellison and W. Allen Martin, *Race and Ethnic Relations in the United States*, (Los Angeles, California: Roxbury Publishing Company, 1997) 112. See also Charles Hirschman and Morrison G. Wong, "Trends in Socio-economic Achievement Among Immigrant and Native-born Asian Americans, *Sociological Quarterly*, V 22, N 4, (1981) 495-514.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Marcus Lee Hansen, "The Third Generation in America," *Commentary*, (November, 1952), 493.
7. Stephen Castles and G. Kosak, *Immigrant Workers and Class Structures in Western Europe* (London, Oxford University Press, 1975), 2.
8. Daniel P. Moynihan, "Transcripts of the American Academy," *Daedalus* 95.1 (Winter 1966), 72-73. See also Talcott Parsons, "Some Theoretical Considerations on the Nature and Trends of Change of Ethnicity," in *Ethnicity: Theory and Practice*, ed. Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan (Cambridge, Mass and London, England, Harvard University Press, 1978), 72, 73.
9. Paul C. Siu, "The Sojourner," *The American Journal of Sociology* 58 (1952) 34-44. See also Robert E. Park, "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," *The American Journal of Sociology* XXXIII (May 1928), 881-893.
10. Naomi Carmon, *Immigration and Integration in Post-Industrial Societies: Theoretical Analysis and Policy-Related Research*, (London: Macmillan in association with Centre for research for Ethnic Relations, University of Warwick, 1996), 23.
11. George Eaton Simpson, "Assimilation," in Kuper Adams, ed. *Social Science Encyclopedia*, (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), 438.
12. Carmon, *Immigration and Integration in Post-Industrial Societies*, 23.
13. John Crowley, "Immigration and 'Race Relations' in Britain and France", in Naomi Carmon, *Immigration and Integration in Post-Industrial Societies: Theoretical Analysis and Policy-Related Research*, (London: Macmillan in association with Centre for research for Ethnic Relations, University of Warwick, 1996), 243.

14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. Nathan Glazer, "Is Assimilation Dead?" *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, V. 530 (November 1993), 133.
17. Carmon, *Immigration and Integration in Post-Industrial Societies*, 23.
18. Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, (Chicago, University of Chicago press, 1921), 511.
19. Ibid., 735.
20. Robert E. Park, "Cultural Conflict and the Marginal Man," in Talcott Parsons, ed. ectal, *Theories of Society: Foundations of Modern Society*, (New York, The Free Press, 1965), 945.
21. Ibid., 946.
22. Bash, *Sociology, Race and Ethnicity*, 69.
23. Edward Cary Hayes, "Some Social Relations Restated," *American Journal of Sociology*, 31 (November 1925), 334, 345.
24. Floyd Nelson House, "Social Relations and Social Interaction," *American Journal of Sociology*, 31 (March 1926), 626-627.
25. Carmon, *Immigration and Integration in Post-Industrial Societies*, 23.
26. Carmon, *Immigration and Integration in Post-Industrial Societies*, 24.
27. Judy Galens, et. al., *Gale Encyclopedia of Multicultural America*, Contributing Editor, Rudolph Vecoli, (Detroit, Michigan, Gale Research, 1995), xxvi.
28. Ibid.
29. Milton M Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*, (New York, Oxford University Press, 1964), 116.
30. Gary Wilson Allen and Roger Asselineau, *St. John De Crevecoeus: The Life of an American Farmer*, (New York, Viking, 1987), 75.
31. Henry Pratt Fairchild, *Immigration: A World Movement and Its American Significance*, (New York, Macmillan 1925), 396.
32. Israel Zangwill, *The Melting Pot*, (New York, Macmillan, 1909), 734.
33. Carmon, *Immigration and Integration in Post-Industrial Societies*, 24.
34. Ibid.

35. Ibid.
36. Ibid.
37. Galens, *Gale Encyclopedia of Multicultural America*, xxxii.
38. R.A. Schermerhorn, *Comparative Ethnic Relations*, (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1978), 122.
39. Ibid., 123.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid., 124
42. Milton M. Gordon, *Human Nature class and Ethnicity*, (New York, Oxford University Press, 1978), 160.
43. Schermerhorn, *Comparative Ethnic Relations*, 125.
44. Carmon, *Immigration and Integration in Post-Industrial Societies*, 24.
45. Ibid., 25.
46. Galens, *Gale Encyclopedia of Multicultural America*, xxxii.
47. Ibid.
48. John Rex, *Ethnic Minorities in the Modern Nation State: Working Papers in the Theory of Multiculturalism and Political Integration*, (Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations: University of Warwick, 1996) 142-143.
49. Ibid., 110.
50. Charles Hirschman, "America's Melting Pot Reconsidered," *Annual Review of Sociology*, V 9 (1983) 401.
51. Nathan Glazer, "Is Assimilation Dead?" *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530 (November 1993) 123.
52. Richard D. Alba, "Assimilation's Quiet Tied," *The Public Interest*, 119 (Spring 1995) 3.
53. Glazer, "Is Assimilation Dead?" 123.
54. Ibid.
55. Rex, *Ethnic Minorities in the Modern Nation State*, 142-143.
56. Stephen Cornell and Douglas Hartmann, *Ethnicity and Race: Making Identities in a Changing World*, (Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Pine Forge Press, 1997) 44-45.

57. Ibid.
58. Ibid., 45.
59. Hirschman, "America's Melting Pot Reconsidered," 401.
60. Rex, *Ethnic Minorities in the Modern Nation State*, 13.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid., 14.
63. Maurice Craft, *Education for Diversity: The Challenge of Cultural Pluralism*. Inaugural lecture. ERIC, ED250408, 1982.
64. Ibid.
65. Ibid.
66. Rex, *Ethnic Minorities in the Modern Nation State*, 15, 16.
67. Ibid.
68. Ibid., 16.
69. Ibid., 77.
36. Pierre L. van den Berghe, *Race and Ethnicity: Essays in Comparative Sociology*, (New York, Basic Books, 1970), 70.
37. Bruce a. Chadwick and Joseph H. Stauss, "The Assimilation of American Indians into Urban Society: The Seattle Case," *Human Organization*, V. 34 no.4, (Winter 1975), 362.
38. Ibid., 362.
73. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, 79.
74. Ibid.
75. Ibid., 81.
76. Bash, *Sociology, Race, and Ethnicity*, 115.
77. Ibid., 242.
78. Ibid., 244.
79. Douglas S. Massey and Brendan P. Mullen, "Processes of Hispanic and Black Spatial Assimilation," *American Journal of Sociology*, V. 89, No.4, (1984), 837.

80. Milton M. Gordon, "Social Structure and Goals in Group Relations", in Monroe Berger, Theodore Abel and Charles H. Page, *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*, (New York, D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc. 1954), 151.
81. Hirschman, "America's Melting Pot Reconsidered," 403.
82. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. *The Disunity of America*, (New York, Norton, 1992), 17.
83. Ibid.
84. Gordon, 245.
85. Milton M. Gordon, "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality", *Daedalus*, (Spring 1961), 279.
86. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, 81.
87. Ibid., 81.
88. Ibid., 80.
89. Robert Schoen and Lawrence E. Cohen, "Ethnic Endogamy among Mexican American Grooms: A Reanalysis of Generational and Occupational Effects," *American Journal of Sociology*, V. 86, no. 2, (July 1980/May 1981) 360.
90. Hirschman, "America's Melting Pot Reconsidered," 404, 405.
91. Chadwick and Stauss, *The Assimilation of American Indians*, 362.
92. Schoen and Cohen, "Ethnic Endogamy among Mexican American Grooms", 360.
93. Richard D. Alba, "A Comment on Schoen and Cohen," *American Journal of Sociology*, V 87, no. 4, (1982), 939.
94. Ibid.
95. Robert Schoen and Lawrence E. Cohen, "Theory and Method in the Study of Ethnic Endogamy among Mexican American Grooms," *American Journal of Sociology*, V. 87, no. 4, (1982) 939.
96. Ibid., 940.
97. Douglas S. Massey and Brendan P. Mullan, "Process of Hispanic and Black Spatial Assimilation," *American Journal of Sociology*, V. 89 No. 4, (1984), 837.
98. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, 78.
99. Massey and Mullan, *Processes of Hispanic and Black Spatial Assimilation*, 837.
100. Gordon, "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality", 242.

101. Ibid.
102. Ibid., 837.
103. Hirschman, "America's Melting Pot Reconsidered," 408.
104. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, 80.
105. Ibid.
106. Chadwick and Stauss, *The Assimilation of American Indians*, 362.
107. Douglas T. Gurak and Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, "Intermarriage among Hispanic Ethnic Groups in New York City," *American Journal of Sociology*, V. 87, No. 4, (1982), 921-22.
108. Ibid., 922.
109. Ibid.
110. Ibid.
111. Deanna L. Pagnini and S. Philip Morgan, "Intermarriage and Social Distance among U. S. Immigrants at the turn of the Century," *American Journal of Sociology*, V. 96, no. 2 (Sept 1990), 406.
112. Ibid.
113. Ibid., 408.
114. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, 80. See Harold J. Abramson, "Assimilation and Pluralism," in Stephen Thernstrom, ed., *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, The Belnap Press of Harvard University Press, 1980), 150-160.
115. Ibid.
116. Ibid.
117. Hirschman, "America's Melting Pot Reconsidered," 409.
118. Ibid.
119. The agencies were as follows: Chinese Chamber of Commerce, Chinese Embassy, Chinese Educational Institute, China Society, Cooper's Company and Coborn School, The General Synod of The Church of England, Great Britain-China Centre, The Greater London Records Office, Hong Kong Government Office, Inner London Education Authority, Institute of Race Relations, Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants, London Borough of Racial Statistics Group, Society for Anglo-Chinese Understanding Ltd., Tower Hamlets Central Library, and the United Kingdom Immigrants Advisory Service. School records from Cooper's Company, Coborn School, and other schools were researched to determine the number of Chinese children

enroled. Names and dates of attendance were shown on the forms. The other agencies records Chinese provided background information, while others provided a narrative and statistical profile of the Chinese community. Tower Hamlets Central Library provided invaluable information. Valuation records and newspaper articles were extremely helpful. The Inner London Education Authority had information on the education of the Chinese children. The Greater London Records Office housed records of the LCC schools, particularly the names and disposition of pupils living in the Limehouse district.

CHAPTER II

ENDNOTES

1. *Morning Chronicle*, 29 July 1782.
2. George Woodcock, *The British in the Far East* (London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1969) xxiii.
3. Ibid.
4. General Register and Record Office of Seamen. *House of Common Papers*, 1859, (Session 2, xxvii), 561. See also, *House of Common Papers*, 1867, (Lxiii), 271 and *House of Common Papers*, 1868, (Lv), 257.
5. Marine Miscellaneous Series of the India Office Records. Marine Department. *Papers on Lascars 1793-1818*, pt. 1, IOR: L/MAR/C/902.
6. Marine Miscellaneous Series, *Report of the Committee on Lascars and other Asiatic Seamen*. 11 July 1815. See also, Marine Miscellaneous Series of the India Office Records. Marine Department. *Papers on Lascars: 1793-1818*, 93-94.
7. The Company hired many Lascars (Asians). Their numbers were much larger than the Chinese.

LASCARS EMPLOYED ON BRITISH VESSELS		
	1891	1896
Trading Abroad	10,525	13,100
Trading to U.K.	10,787	14,911
Total	21,312	28,011

8. *House of Commons Papers 1859* (Session 2, XXVII), 561. Also *House of Commons Papers 1867*, (LXIII), 271. These statistics show a discrepancy in the number of foreign for the year 1858. The 1867 Report shows 11,458 men. In the *House of Commons Papers 1868-1869*, (LV), 257. The number of British seamen for the year 1868 was 177,289.

3. *Notes and Queries*, 9 May 1896.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.

12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. *National Register*, 13 October 1813.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Marine Miscellaneous, *Papers*, 1:35.
19. Ibid., 1:77.
20. Ibid., 2:111.
21. Ibid., The men were allotted 2 pence per day for tobacco.
22. Ibid., 2:105.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid., 2:120. The amounts are given in British pounds.
25. Ibid., 1:34.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid., 1:33.
28. Ibid., 1:34.
29. Ibid., 2:111.
30. Ibid., 1:27-28.
31. Anglo-Indian (Asian) word meaning "native boatswaine, or captain of a Lascar crew."
32. Marine Miscellaneous, *Papers*, 1:48.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid., 2:84.
35. Ibid., 1:76.
36. Ibid., 1:48-49.
37. *The Times*, 10 May 1855.

38. The First Report from the Committee on the State of the Police of the Metropolis, 2 May 1817, 195.
39. Ibid., 123.
40. Ibid., 123.
41. Marine Miscellaneous, *Papers*, 1:27-28.
42. Ibid. This letter was sent to the Company in April 1814.
43. Ibid., 1:53.
44. A labourer employed to load and unload ships; a stevedore.
45. Marine Miscellaneous Series of the India Office Records. *Papers on Lascars 1793-1818*. Part 2. IOR: L/MSR/C/902, 84.
46. Marine Miscellaneous, *Papers*, 1:21.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid.
49. Ibid., 1:23.
50. Marine Miscellaneous, *Papers*, 1:38.
51. Ibid.
52. Marine Miscellaneous, *Papers*, 2:125.
53. *The Times*, 21 January 1836.
54. *The Times*, 21 Sept 1882.
55. Ibid.
56. *The Times*, 10 May 1855.
57. *The Times*, 4 April 1873.
58. *The Times*, 1877.
59. *The Times*, 22 Nov 1879.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid.
62. Annis Lennoys, "China Town in London Town," *Sunday Magazine* (1899), 508.

63. Ibid.
64. Ibid.
65. One Who Has Tried It, "What Opium Smoking Feels Like," *JBP Collection*, Stepney, No. 10805 (1870).
66. *The Times*, 14 November 1836.
67. *The Morning Chronicle*, 1782.
68. M. Cardwell (ed), *Charles Dickens: The Mystery of Edwin Drood*, (The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1972), xvi.
69. Ibid., 123.
70. Ibid., 122, 123.
71. Count E. Armfelt, "Oriental London," in George Sims, *Living in London*, Cassels, 1902), 7.
72. Horace, Thorogood, *East of Oldgate* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1935), 121.
73. Douglas Jones, "The Chinese in Britain: Origins and Development of a Community," *New Commentary, Journal of the Commission for Racial Equality*, V vii; no 3, Winter 1979, 397.
74. Armfelt, *Oriental London*, 11.
75. Ruth Body, Interview at her home, Rochford, Essex, June 1985.
76. *The Times*, December 12, 1826.

CHAPTER III

ENDNOTES

1. London County Council, *Gill Street LCC Senior Boy's Admission Register: 1906-1932*; London County Council, *Gill Street LCC Infant's Admissions Register: 1923-1947*; London County Council, *Gill Street Senior Girl's Admission Register: 1932-1939*; *George Green's School for Boys and Girls 1884-1909*; *George Green's Schools Admission Records: 1910-1950*.
2. Ibid.
3. London County Council, *1911-1912 Annual Report*. See also, London County Council, *Dingle Lane and Dolphin Lane Temporary Schools*, 1908.
4. Ibid.
5. Inspectors Report, *Dingle Lane LCC*, Division 5, 28 May 1915. See also, Inspectors Report, *Dingle Lane LCC*, Division 4, 17 March 1932.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. *The Daily Telegraph*, 26 June 1920.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. London County Council, *Gill Street Senior Girl's Register: 1932-1939*.
20. London County Council, *Gill Street Boy's Admission Register: 1906-1932*.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.
24. London County Council, *Gill Street Infant's Admission Register: 1923-1947.*
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Since 1970, three of these schools, Parmiters (Watford), George Green's (Isle of Dogs), and Cooper's Company Schools that merged with Coborn's (Upminster) have left the area and moved into new facilities.
28. George Green School, *George Green's Admission Records: 1910-1950.* See also, H.C. Wilks, *George Green's School and Its Surroundings in and Near Poplar.* London: Edward Arnold, Published at the School, 1971.
29. London County Council, *Gill Street Boy's*, 1929-1938.
30. Ibid.
31. London County Council, *Gill Street Senior Girl's*, 1932-1939.
32. London County Council, *Inspectors Report: Dingle Lane LCC*, Division 5, 17 March 1932.
33. Ibid.
34. London County Council, "School Visitation", 27 April 1915, 11 & 19 May 1915.
35. London County Council, *Inspectors Report: Dingle Lane LCC*, Division 5, 17 March 1932.
36. Ibid.
37. London County Council, *Inspectors Report: Gill Street LCC*, Division 5, 17 March 1931.
38. Ibid.
39. London County Council, *Gill Street Infant's Register: 1923-1947.*
40. Home Office, "Report on Miss Robinson's Allegations re Chinamen." 1 February 1911. HO45/11843/139147/18. See also London County Council. Public Control Dept. "Report on Miss Robinson. . . ." 30 January 1911. EO/GEN/1/72.
41. Ibid.
42. London County Council, "Letter of Rosina Robinson," 1 February 1911, EO/GEN/1/72.
43. Ibid.

44. Ibid.
45. Ibid.
46. London County Council, "Letter to Miss Robinson from the London County Council Education Office (Mr. Blair)," 2 February 1911, EO/GEN/1/72.
47. London County Council, "Letter of Rosina Robinson to Mr Blair," 2 February 1911, EO/GEN/1/72.
48. Ibid.
49. London County Council, "Letter from Florrie Rees," 5 February 1911, EO/GEN/1/72.
50. London County Council, "Report of Mr Jackson to Dr Kimmins (LCC Education Department Chief Inspectors Branch)," [n.d.], EO/GEN/1/72.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid.
53. Ibid.
54. Ibid.
55. London County Council, "Report of F. R. Garnham (Inspector)," 7 February 1911, EO/GEN/1/72.
56. Ibid.
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid.
59. London County Council, "Mr. E R Henry, New Scotland Yard, Letter to Clerk," 8 February 1911.
60. Home Office, New Scotland Yard, "Final Police Report," 8 February 1911.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid.
63. London County Council, Public Health Department, "The Report of Shirley F Murphy, Medical Officer," 11 February 1911.
64. Home Office, "Letter to Sir Edward Henry, New Scotland Yard". 16 February 1911. HO45 11843/139147/18.
65. *The Times*, 10 March 1911.

66. *The Liverpool Courier*, 27 December 1906.
67. Ibid. ". . . indeed, [it] is sufficient to maintain them [the Chinese] in comfort--but their wonderful mimetic faculty is ever at work."
68. Ibid., 56.
69. Ibid.
70. Maurice Broady, "The Social Adjustments of Chinese Immigrants in Liverpool", *Sociological Review*, (1955, 3:11), 68.
71. Ibid., 69. The Masonic Hall no longer exists in London.
72. *The East End News*, 16 April 1912.
73. Ibid. See also, *The East End News*, 30 April 1912.
74. Ibid.
75. *Daily Express*, 20 October 1920.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid.
78. *Liverpool Courier*, 27 November 1906.
79. Ibid.
80. *The Times*, 21 January 1921.
81. Ibid. See also, *The Times*, 6 October 1920.
82. *The Times*, 2 November 1872.
83. Ibid.
84. Ibid.
85. *The Times*, 21 January 1911.
86. Ibid.
87. *The Times*, 8 May 1911. See Home Office HO45 11843/139147/02. See also *The Guardian*, 2 January 1962.
88. *East End News*, 30 April 1912. See also *The Times*, 13 April 1912 and 15 April 1912.
89. J. P. May, "The Chinese in Britain, 1860-1914", in C. Holmes, *Immigrants & Minorities in British Society* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978), 117.

90. *The Evening Express*, 18 August 1916. See *The Evening Times*, 17 August 1916.
91. Home Office, Report of the Commission . . . , 26 June 1907, HO45 11843/1391476/15. See also *The Daily Mail* on 7 October 1920.
92. *Manchester Guardian*, 13 December 1920.
93. *Daily Telegraph*, 26 June 1920.
94. Ibid.
95. Ibid.
96. *The Daily Chronicle*, 15 December 1920. See also, *East London Observer*, 25 December 1920 and *The Daily Chronicle*, 15 December 1920.
97. Ibid. See also, *East London Observer*, 25 December 1920.
98. Ibid.
99. The General Synod of the Church of England, Church House Archives (Westminster), Commission on Orientals and Others in England 1930-1932, Survey and Budget Committee Central Committee.
100. Ibid.
101. "Chinese School in London," *The China Journal* (XXII:1, January 1935), 46.
102. "Appeal for funds for the New Club house, *Daily Sketch*, 23 April 1934.
103. *New Chronicle*, 28 May 1936.
104. "Chinese School in London", 46.

CHAPTER IV

ENDNOTES

1. *Daily Telegraph*, 11 March 1911; see also *Daily Express*, 4 March 1911.
2. Home Office, Report of Head Constable of Liverpool, November 1911, HO45 11843/139147/33.
3. J. P. May, "The Chinese in Britain, 1860-1914," in C. Holmes, *Immigrants and Minorities in British Society* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978) 111.
4. Ibid. See the following reports: "The Murder of a Chinaman, *East End News*, 26 May 1911. "Limehouse Street Fight," *East London Advertiser*, 20 April 1912. "East End Warfare," *East London Advertiser*, 4 May 1912. See also *The Liverpool Courier*, 27 November 1906.
5. *The Manchester Guardian*, 13 December 1920.
6. *The Times*, 17 January 1921.
7. Ibid.
8. *The Liverpool Courier*, 27 November 1906.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid. See also, Home Office, *Report of the Commission*....26 June 1907, HO45 11843/139147/15
13. Before 1905 these *Annual Reports* did not separate the Chinese from other foreign nationals.
14. See Home Office, Report of the Commission . . . , 26 June 1907, HO45 11843/139147/15.
15. Home Office, "Proof of Debates", 25 November 1908, HO45 11843/139147/16.
16. *Daily Telegraph*, 11 March 1911; see also *Daily Express*, 4 March 1911.
17. *Liverpool Courier*, 27 November 1906.
18. Home Office, "Report from the Chief Constable of Birkenhead", 7 December 1906, HO45/11843/139147/7. See also J.P. May, "The Chinese in Britain, 1860-1914," in Colin Holmes, *Immigrants and Minorities in British Society* (London, George Allen & Unwin, 1978), 120.

19. Home Office, "Report of Head Constable of Liverpool", November 1911, HO45 11843/139147/33.
20. Home Office, "Report from the Chief Constable of Birkenhead". 7 December 1906, HO45/11843/139147/7.
21. Metropolitan Borough of Poplar, The Parish of Poplar Borough, *Valuation List 1910*.
22. Ibid.
23. Metropolitan Borough of Polar, The Parish of Polar Borough, *Valuations Lists of 1910, 1915, 1918, 1921, 1925, 1930, 1935, 1939, 1945, 1950*.
24. *The Times*, 27 May 1916.
25. Ibid.
26. Metropolitan Borough of Polar, The Parish of Polar Borough, *Valuations Lists of 1925, 1930, and 1935*.
27. Ibid., *Valuation List of 1915*.
28. Ibid., *Valuation List of 1920*.
29. Ibid., *Valuation List of 1925*.
30. Ibid., *Valuation List of 1930*.
31. Ibid., *Valuation List of 1935*.
32. Ibid.
33. *Daily Express*, 27 March 1936.
34. Ibid.
35. D. Caradog Jones, *The Social Survey of Merseyside*, (University Press of Liverpool, Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., V 2, 1934), 406.
36. *Census of England and Wales*, 1911, Preliminary Report, (V. IX), 224. The Home Office, Chinese Crews on British Ships, [n.d.] HO45 11843/139147/23 and HO4511843/139147/32 report from 1 April 1910 to 31 March 1911.
37. *Census of Seamen*, 1911, (Cd 6442), vi.
38. Ibid.
39. "Asiatic Agreements," *The Seaman*, March 1914, 85.
40. *The Seaman*, 13 June 1913. See also. "Asiatic Agreements," *The Seaman*, March 1914, 85.

41. *Manchester Evening Chronicle*, 9 March 1914.
42. "Asiatic Agreements," *The Seaman*, March 1914, 85.
43. Ibid.
44. *The Seaman*, 19 September 1919.
45. *The Seaman*, 28 March 1919.
46. *The Seaman*, 15 June 1923.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid.
49. *The Seaman*, January 1929. See also HO45 11522/187.
50. *The Seaman*, February 1929.
51. Home Office, "The Yellow Peril in London", [n.d.] HO45 494270/41. See also, *Hansard Report* (2365, no. 99), 9 May 1929.
52. Ibid.
53. *The Seaman*, January 1931.
54. Marine Transportation, "Use of Chinese Labour for Military Purposes," MT25/8/77164/1917, 24 September 1917.
55. Marine Transportation, "Extracts from Draft Ward Cabinet Minutes, 273", MT 25/8/77164/1917, 24 September 1917.
56. Marine Transportation, "Use of Chinese Labour for Military Purposes," MT25/8/77164/1917, 24 September 1917.
57. Home Office, "Aliens approved for munitions work, HO45 16809/311425, January 1918.
58. Home Office, "Supply of Chinese Seamen", HO45 11843/139147/92, 12 July 1918.
59. Home Office, "Letter to the Board of Maritime Commissioners", [n.d.], HO 45 11843/139147/83.
60. *East End News*, 15 May 1908.
61. *The Post Office Directory for London, 1894*, (London: Kelly & Company Limited, 1894), 481.
62. *Post Office Directory: London*, Kelly's Directory Ltd., 1902.

63. *East End News*, 15 May 1908.
64. Ibid.
65. *The Seaman*, March 1908. See also *The Seaman*, January 1908.
66. Ibid.
67. No more than 40 boarding houses in London were operated by the Chinese.
68. London County Council, *Licensing of Seamen's Lodging Houses: Annual Reports, 1910-1929*, PH/Reg/1/23. See also *The Times*, 10 June 1916.
69. *The Time*, 28 February 1906. See also *The Times*, 20 October 1900.
70. *The Times*, 14 October 1900.
71. Ibid.
72. Kwee Choo Ng, *The Chinese in London*, Institute of Race Relations (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 8.
73. *The Evening News*, January 1901.
74. *The Times*, 28 February 1906.
75. *The Times*, 22 November 1906.
76. Home Office, "Report of Chief Constable of Birkenhead", 7 December 1906, HO45 11843/139147/07.
77. Home Office, "Report of Head Constable of Liverpool", 8 December 1906, HO45 11843/139147/08. See *The Liverpool Courier*, 27 November 1906. See also Home Office, "Extracts from Liverpool H.O.H.'s Report for 1911", 25 August 1911, HO4511843/139147/40.
78. *Daily Express*, 18 April 1907. See also, Home Office, Report of the Commission Appointed by the City Council to Inquire into Chinese Settlements in Liverpool, 26 June 1907, HO45 11843/39147.
79. Ibid.
80. Home Office, "Report of the Commission Appointed by the City Council to Inquire into Chinese Settlements in Liverpool", 26 June 1907, HO45 11843/139147/15.
81. *The South Wales Daily News*, 5 Mar 1910.
82. Ng, *Chinese*, 10.
83. *The South Wales Daily News*, 5 Mar 1910.
84. Ibid.

85. Douglas Jones, *The Chinese in Britain: Origins and Development of a Community*, *New Community: Journal of the Commission for Racial Equality*. (V vii. No 3, Winter 1979), 399. See also, Ng, *Chinese*, 10.
86. The number of laundrymen in London was twenty-seven by 1951. Ng, *Chinese*, 10.
87. East London Dockland Streets, Extract Ii 119.
88. *The Times*, 25 November 1913.
89. Ibid.
90. Ibid.
91. James L Watson, *Between Two Cultures: Migrants and Minorities in Britain*, (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1972), 182.
92. Ibid.
93. Maurice Broady, "Social Adjustment of Chinese Immigrants in Liverpool", *Sociological Review*, (1955, 3:11), 68.
94. Marine Transportation, "Correspondence", 14 March 1940, MT9/3350.
95. Marine Transportation, "Anglo-Chinese Agreement", 19 May 1944, MT9 3958. See also, Marine Transportation, "International Transport Worker's Federation", 3 July 1944, MT9 3958; Marine Transportation, "Correspondence", [n.d.], MT9 3350; Marine Transportation, "Agreement", 8 August 1942, MT9 3650; Marine Transportation, "Ministry of War Transport Marine Division", 3 August 1944, MT9 4011; Marine Transportation, "Seamen Abroad", 14 March 1945, MT9 4/25.
96. Ibid.
97. Ibid.
98. *The Chinese Nationalist Daily*, 18/19 January 1945, in Marine Transportation, "Comparative Table Illustrating Inequalities of Treatment Between Chinese and British Seamen", MT9/4106/72116.
99. Ibid. See also *The East London Advertiser*, 21 February 1942..
100. Ibid.
101. Ibid.
102. Ibid.

CHAPTER V

ENDNOTES

1. Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 111.
2. J.M. Evans, *Immigration Law* (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1983), 43.
3. Ibid.
4. *The Seaman*, March 1914.
5. Ibid.
6. The 1914 Act was primarily used as a "preventive measure" during World War I. See Kwee Choo Ng, *The Chinese in London*, Institute of Race Relations (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 8.
7. *The Seaman*, 19 March 1920.
8. *The Seaman*, 13 August 1915.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. "Chinese Cheap Labour," *The Seaman*, March 1908, 2.
12. *The Seaman*, March 1914.
13. D. Kohler, "Immigration & Race Relations," Library Publication Department, (Study Paper #7), 1976.
14. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Joint Committee on the Nationality of Married Women," [n.d.], HO45/11522/116.
15. Ibid.
16. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Census of Aliens in the U.K.," 31 December 1924, HO45 115422 187 and 31 December 1922, HO45 115422 164. See *The Evening Express*, 18 August 1916. See also *The Times*, 10 June 1916.
17. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Metropolitan Police Office: 6 August 1917," HO45 15592/344072. See also, United Kingdom, Home Office, "New Scotland Yard," 12 July 1917, HO45 15592/344072.
18. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Registration of Chinese Subjects," 9 February 1934, HO45 15592/344072.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.

21. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Letter from Foreign Office to Chinese Legation, 22 March 1934, HO45/15592/344072. See United Kingdom, Home Office, "Registration of Chinese Subjects," HO45/115592/344072.
22. United Kingdom, London County Council, "Common Lodging Houses and Seamen's Lodging Houses: Acts and By-laws Applying to London," County Hall, 1908, PH/REC/1/28. See PH/REG/1/23. See also, HO45/11843/139147/75.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid.
25. United Kingdom, London County Council, *Lodging Houses*, 43.
26. "Chinese Lodging Houses," *East End News*, 23 May 1911.
27. "Chinatown," *East End News*, 13 June 1916. Also on "New Yellow Peril," *The Times*, 10 June 1916.
28. "The Limehouse Chinamen," *East End News*, 18 January 1921.
29. "Chinese Settlement in Liverpool," *Daily Post*, 9 March 1907.
30. *The Seaman*, March 1908.
31. Ibid. See also, *The Shipping World*, 20 May 1908.
32. *The Times*, 26 April 1911. See also, *The Times*, 20 April 1911.
33. Ibid. See also, *Daily Debates*, 12 April 1911 and 23 April 1911.
34. Ibid. See also, *The Times*, 26 April 1911.
35. *The Seaman*, March 1908.
36. "Anti-Chinese Agitation in Poplar," *East End News*, 15 May 1919. See *The Seaman*, August 1908.
37. *Daily Express*, 17 April 1907.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid. See, United Kingdom, Home Office, "Chinese Settlement in Liverpool," [n.d.], HO45 11843/139147/15.
40. United Kingdom, Home Office, "The Importation of Chinamen into Liverpool," January 1910, HO45 11843/139147/20. See The Home Office, "A Statement with Regard to the Expulsions of Aliens, 1910, HO45 24550.
41. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Immigration: Action of Master of S. S. Tydeus," 3 March 1914, HO45/11843/139147/53.

42. Ibid.
43. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Importation," HO45 11843/139147/20.
44. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Importation of Chinese into Liverpool," 19 April 1911, HO45 11843/139147/21.
45. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Anonymous Letter," [n.d. 192], HO45 11849/139147/164.
46. Ibid. See United Kingdom, Home Office, "New Scotland Yard," 26 August 1921, HO45 11849/139147/167.
47. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Birkenhead Borough Police," 29 June 1921, HO45 11849/139147/165. See The Home Office, 29 July 1921 (HO45 11849/1139147/167).
48. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Smuggling of Chinamen into England," 28 August 1921, HO45 11849/139147/169.
49. Ibid. See also United Kingdom, Home Office, "Smuggling of Chinamen to England," 20 August 1921, HO 45 11849/139147/169. See The Home Office, "Smuggling of Chinamen into England," September 1921, HO 45 11849/139147/175).
- The Times*, 27 August 1921. See also HO45 11849/139147/184, HO45 11849/139147/192, HO45 11849/139147/205, HO45 11849/139147/208, HO45 11849/139147/230a, and HO45 11849/139147/256.
50. United Kingdom, Home Office, Air Ministry of Department of Works and Building, "Letter to Ministry of Shipping," 17 January 1919, HO45 11843/139147/125a. See, Home Office, HO45 11849/139147/125a, HO45 10809/311425/81, HO45/10809/311425/81 and HO45/10836/33000.
51. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Minutes of The Alien and Nationality Committee," 28 March 1919, HO45/11843/139147/130a.
52. Ibid. See United Kingdom, Home Office, "Chinese Seamen at British Ports," 24 March 1919, HO45/11843/139147/130a and HO45/11849/139147/126, 31 January 1919.
53. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Minutes of The Alien and Nationality Committee," 30 March 1919, HO45/11843/139147/133.
54. Ibid.
55. Ibid. See also, United Kingdom, Home Office, "New Scotland Yard," 26 June 1919, HO45/11843/139147/133.
56. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Minutes of The Aliens and Nationality Committee," 25 June 1919, HO45/11843/139147/137.

57. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Memorandum of the Aliens and Nationality Committee: Repatriation of Chinese prepared by the Ministry of Labour," 28 May 1919, HO45/11843/139147/137.
58. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Letter of Officer of the Superintending Aliens Office to the Home Office," 20 June 1919, HO45/11843/139147/136.
59. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Report of the New Scotland Yard: Chinese Seamen," 26 June 1919, HO45/11843/139147/136.
60. Ibid.
61. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Report of the Cardiff City Police," 8 June 1919, HO45/11843/139147/135.
62. United Kingdom, Home Office, "New Scotland Yard," HO45/11843/139147/136.
63. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Report of the Head Constable, Liverpool," 19 July 1919, HO45/11843/139147/141a.
64. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Letter to the Home Office: Repatriation of Chinese," 20 June 1919, HO45/11843/139147/136.
65. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Superintending Officer," HO45/11843/139147/136.
66. Ibid.
67. Ibid. See also, United Kingdom, Home Office, "Superintending Officer," HO45 /11843 /139147 /136.
68. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Labour Emergency Expenditure Committee," 2 July 1919, HO45/11843/139147/140. See United Kingdom, Home Office, "Report of the Head Constable, Liverpool," 19 September 1919, HO45/11843/139147/146.
69. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Report to the Home Office," 15 August 1919. HO45/11843/139147
70. Ibid.
71. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Memorandum, Secretary of State: Repatriation of Chinese Seamen," 13 September 1919, HO45/11843/139147/141a.
72. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Report to the Home Office," HO45/11843/139147/141a.
73. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Minutes of The Aliens and Nationality Committee," 19 September 1919, HO45/139147/149.

74. *The Seaman*, December 1907. See *The Seaman*, July 1908. See also, *East London Observer*, 10 April 1909.
75. *The Seaman*, June 1908.
76. Ibid. See *The South Wales Argus*, 24 January 1908.
77. *The South Wales Argus*, 24 January 1908. See also "Chinese Cheap Labour," *The Seaman*, March 1908.
78. Ibid.
79. "The Revolt of the White Seamen," *The Seaman*, June 1908, 4.
80. *The Seaman*, June 1908.
81. *The Seaman*, February 1908.
82. Ibid.
83. Ibid.
84. *The Seaman*, May 1909.
85. "The Storms blows over" *The Seaman*, June 1908.
86. *The Seaman*, May 1909.
87. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Minutes of the Board of Trade," 4 July 1916, HO45 11843/139147/86.
88. "Chinese Cheap Labour," *The Seaman*, March 1908, 3.
89. "Mr. Hudson Kearley's Speech," *The Seamen*, March 1908, 4.
90. Ibid.
91. *The Seaman*, July 1908.
92. Ibid.
93. Ibid.
94. Ibid.
95. *The Times*, 26 April 1911.
96. Ibid.
97. *The Times*, 26 April 1911. See also *The Seaman*, July 1908, 7.
98. Ibid.

99. *Evening Standard*, 7 October 1940.
100. *New Community Journal of the Commission for Racial Equality*, (V. vii. no. 3, Winter, 1979), 399.
101. *The Times*, 14 December 1906.
102. Ibid.
103. Ibid.
104. *The Times*, 2 July 1907.
105. Ibid.
106. *The Shipping World*, 20 May 1908.
107. Ibid.
108. Ibid.
109. *The Seaman*, 20 February 1935.
110. Ibid.
111. Ibid.
112. Ibid.
113. *The Daily Chronicle*, 26 January 1908.
114. *The Reynolds Newspaper*, 26 January 1908.
115. *The Cardiff Maritime Review*, 8 July 1911. See also *The Times*, 18 July 1910.
116. *The Seaman*, 29 January 1915. See also *The Seaman*, 30 July 1915 and 19 November 1915.
117. *The Seaman*, May 1908.
118. Ibid.
119. "Chinatown Boarding Houses," *The Seaman*, 2 June 1916.
120. "Further Important Subject Discussed at Trade Union Congress," *The Seaman*, 2 June 1916.
121. *The Seaman*, 2 June 1916.
122. Home Office records (Chinese Trafficking in Opium, 22 November 1919 and 13 November 1919, HO 45 24683/32).
123. "Further Important Subjects.....," *The Seaman*, 2 June 1916.

124. *The Times*, Chinese in East End of London, 23 May 1916.
125. United Kingdom, Home Office, "The Commission of Police, New Scotland Yard", 19 July 1916, HO45 11843/139147/83. See *The Times*, 18 July 1910. See also *The Seaman*, March 1916.
126. United Kingdom, Home Office, "International Headquarters of Salvation Army," 19 July 1916, HO45 11843/139147/83.
127. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Letter from the National Sailor's & Firemen's Union to His Majesty King George V", 22 May 1916, HO45 11843/139147/82.
128. Ibid., See also, *The Seaman*, 19 March 1920.
129. *The Seaman*, 14 February 1919.
130. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Repatriation of Chinese Seamen." HO45/11843/39147/149.
131. *Repatriation of Seaman*, 26 June 1917. HO 11843/139147/136.
132. *The Times*, 10 February 1920.
133. "The Chinese Peril...." *The Seaman*, 2 June 1916.
134. *The Daily Telegraph*, 24 November 1933. See *The Seaman*, 29 November 1933. See also *The Seaman*, 20 February 1935.
135. "Chinese Labour," *The Times*, 4 April 1873.
136. William Montagu, *Round London: Down East and Up West* (London: MacMillan & Co. 1892), 117.
137. Ibid., 119.
138. Ibid., 123.
139. *The Liverpool Courier*, 27 December 1906.
140. Kwee Choo Ng, *The Chinese In London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), 49.
141. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Report of Head Constable of Liverpool," 8 December 1906, HO45/11843/139147.
142. *The Liverpool Courier*, 16 September 1916. See also, United Kingdom, Home Office, "Chinese in Liverpool," HO45 24683 16.
143. Ibid.
144. Ibid.

CHAPTER VI

ENDNOTES

1. George Mitchell, *Down in Limehouse* (London, Stanley Martin & Co., Ltd. 1925), 21.
2. Ibid.
3. United Kingdom, Home Office, "Minutes," City of Liverpool, 1906-07, 1745. See also, United Kingdom, Home Office, "Report of the Commission . . .," 26 June 1907, HO 45 11843/139147.
4. *Daily Telegraph*, 10 December 1906.
5. *Daily News*, 14 April 1920.
6. *The Times*, 19 September 1917.
7. *The Evening News*, 5 October 1920. See also *Daily Telegraph*, 5 October 1920.
8. Ibid.
9. *The Evening News*, 5 October 1920. See also *The Minutes, City of Liverpool City Council* (1907), p 1745-6.
10. *The Evening News*, 7 October 1920.
11. Horace Thorogood, *East of Oldgate* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1935) 54.
12. "Yellow Peril in London," *Daily Express*, 1 October 1920.
13. *The Evening News*, 5 October 1920.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. "White Girls Hypnotised by Yellow Men," *The Evening News*, 5 October 1920.
17. *The Daily Telegraph*, 5 October 1920.
18. "What Chinatown Says," F.W.J. Underwood, *East London Advertiser* 7 October 1920. See also *Western Mail*, 21 July 1911, *Daily Express*, 18 April 1907, *Evening News*, 14 October 1920, *Daily Telegraph*, 8 October 1920, and *The Times* 18 October 1915.
19. "Chinatowns Lure of Pretty Clothes," *East End News*, 7 October 1920.
20. Underwood, 7 October 1920.
21. "White Girls," *The Evening News*, 5 October 1920.

22. "Chinatowns Lure of Pretty Clothes," *East End News*, 7 October 1920.
23. *The Evening News*, 7 October 1920.
24. Ibid. See *The Evening News and Evening Mail*, 5 October 1920, and "English girls and Chinamen: East End Dens of Vice [*East End News*, (n.d.)].
25. *The Daily Telegraph*, 5 October 1920. See also United Kingdom, Home Office, "Cardiff Police Head Constable to Lord Mayor of Cardiff," HO45 129817/3, 28 September 1908.
26. Chinatowns Lure, 7 October 1920.
27. *The Evening News*, October 1920.
28. Ibid.
29. *East End News*, 7 October 1920.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid.
33. Anthony H. Richmond, *Coloured Minorities in Britain: A Chinese Community in Lancashire* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954), 232.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid.
36. Maurice Broady, "The Social Adjustment of Chinese Immigrants in Liverpool," *Sociological Review*, (1955, 3:11), 72.
37. Broady, *Adjustment*, 72.
38. *East London Observer*, 7 October 1920.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid. See also *The Christian Herald and Signs of Our Times*, 22 November 1934.
41. Broady, *Adjustment*, 71.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid., 72.
44. *The Evening News*, 11 April 1931.

45. F. W. J. Underwood, "What Chinatown Says," *East End News*. 7 October 1920.
46. *East End News*, 30 May 1916. See also *The Christian Herald and Signs of Our Times*, 22 November 1934.
47. Ibid.
48. Jannette Cheong, "From the East End to the Far East", *Eastern Horizon*, (V. 17 #9, September 1978,) 11.
49. United Kingdom, Home Office, Report of the Head Constable (Birkenhead), "Chinamen Resident in the Boro'", HO45 11843/39147/07, 31 March 1906.
50. Kwee Choo Ng, *The Chinese in London*, Institute of Race Relations, (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 8. See also *The Times*, 12 July 1909 and *Daily Telegraph*, 5 October 1920.
51. United Kingdom, Home Office, Report of the Head Constable (Liverpool), "Chinamen in Liverpool", HO45 11843/139147/08, 8 December 1906.
52. The procedure used for the research has been explained in this section.
53. *The Times*, 13 November 1905.
54. The marriage certificates lists this information.
55. The result of the data collected from the marriage registers at St. Catharines House had been consolidated to provide this chart. The ten-year period (1921-1930) suggests that a total of 270 Chinese marriages, 231 mixed-marriages and 39 endogamous marriages or 86 percent as compared to the latter of 14 percent were conducted during this period.
56. The method of research has been discussed. By taking the statistical information from the initial survey, the number of mixed-marriages was calculated and recorded according to the data collected.
57. The figures represent the total number of mixed-marriages for this period collected from the marriage registers at St. Catherine's House.
58. Compiled survey results from the marriage registers at St. Catherine's House.
59. Ibid.
60. These were the school records of the county schools. It was determined that the closest schools that the offspring would attend were Dingle lane and Gill Street LCC.
61. United Kingdom, London County Council, Gill Street LCC, *Senior's Girls Admissions Register, 1932-1938*. See also the admission and discharge records of London County Council, Cyril Jackson LCC (1924-1939, 1947-1950); London County Council, Gill Street LCC (Senior Boy's 1906-1932, Junior Boy's 1932-1938, Infants

1923-1947); London County Council, Northey Street LCC, London County Council, Ricardo Street LCC, and London County Council, Farrence Street LCC.

62. In the initial survey to determine the number of mixed-marriages, the names of the children attending the London County Schools were used to determine explicitly whether they were offspring of mixed marriages. Not all of the marriages were found either because the parents were not legally married, the names were not recorded correctly, or possibly married elsewhere outside the United Kingdom.

63. Ibid.

64. Again, the names of the children were used and matched to the marriage records at St. Catherine's House. Not all of the children could be found. Reasons for their apparent exclusion may be due to the fact they chose not to marry, died, left the United Kingdom, etc.

CHAPTER VII

ENDNOTES

1. Inner London Education Authorities (ILEA), *Education Statistics*. Information Offices, Research Branch, 17.
2. See also *ILEA*, 17.
3. *ILEA*, 16. See also *ILEA*, 17.
4. Ibid. 16. See also HAC II: 23.
5. House of Commons, Second Report from the Home Affairs Committee, Session 1984-85, "Chinese Community in Britain," Volumes I, II, III (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office), To be referred to as HAC, Volume and page number. HAC II: 23. See also HAC II: 28.
6. HAC I: xxxiv. See also HAC II: 240 and. HAC I: vii.
7. HAC I: vii. See also HAC II: 240 and HAC III: 11.
8. HAC I: xi. See also HAC II: 240.
9. HAC II: 240.
10. Brian Jackson and Anne Garvey, "The Chinese Children of Britain, *Race and Immigration: A New Society Social Studies Reader*, 2nd Ed. 21.
11. Ibid.
12. HAC III:64
13. HAC II: 240.
14. HAC II: 18.
15. Ibid.
16. HAC II: 23.
17. Ibid.
18. *Times Educational Supplement*, 31 July 1981.
19. Ibid.
20. HAC III: 64.
21. HAC II: 146.
22. HA I: xiii.

23. HAC III: 159.
24. HAC II: 89.
25. HAC II: 19. See also HAC III: 26.
26. HAC II: 24.
27. HAC III: 93.
28. HAC II: 71. See also HAC III: 48.
29. HAC III: 240.
30. Anne Garvey and Brian Jackson, *Chinese Children*, Research and Action Project into the Needs of Chinese Children, National Educational Research and Development Trust, 1975, 2.
31. HAC II: 242.
32. HAC III: 192. See HAC II: 71, HAC III: B. Hunt, "Chinese School Children in Britain: A Report," 25 and HAC II: 240.
33. Garvey and Jackson, *Chinese Children*, 28.
34. HAC III: 148.
35. "Liverpool's Chinese," *Guardian*, 2 January 1962, 5.
36. HAC II: 27.
37. Ibid.
38. HAC II: 23.
39. Derek Bryan, "Chinese Communities in Britain," *China Now*, Autumn 84 no. 110, 23.
40. HAC III: 101. See also *The Times*, 20 August 1969.
41. *The Chinese in the U. K.*, A Report of the Proceedings of the Conference with Additional Papers on Nationality, Education, Bibliography and Statistics, (London), Published for the Chinese Action Group and Quakers Community Relations Committee by the Commission for Racial Equality, December 1978, 16.
42. Garvey and Jackson, *Chinese Children*, 7.
43. Douglas Jones, "The Chinese in Britain," *New Community*, Journal for Racial Equality, vii: 3, Winter 1979, 401.
44. Maurice Broady, "The Social Adjustment of Chinese Immigrants in Liverpool," *Sociological Review*, (1955, 3:11), 74.

45. Ibid.
46. HAC III: 195. It was also reported that many do not read Chinese as well.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid.
49. Ibid.
50. HAC III: 25. See also HAC II: xiii, *The Chinese in the U. K.*, 10 and HAC I: xii-xiv.
51. HAC III: 101
52. HAC III: 66. See also HA II: 101.
53. HAC III: 50. See, HAC III: 162 and HAC III: 66.
54. HAC II: 109.
55. HAC III: 66.
56. HAC III: 162.
57. Ibid. See also, HAC III: 66.
58. HAC II: 105.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid.
61. HAC III: 25.
62. HAC III: 92.
63. Ibid.
64. HAC III: 60.
65. Ibid.
66. *The Daily Telegraph*, 18 February 1983, 15.
67. Patricia Langton, *Chinese Children in British Schools*, Produced and Printed by ILEA Course Support Unit, Center for Urban Educational Studies, Occasional Paper no. 2, n.d., 5.
68. Victor Y. F. Chann, *Conference on Chinese in Scotland*. Unpublished speech, May 1976. See also, *The Times*, 6 August 1980.
69. HAC II: 64. See also HAC I: xiii.

70. Ibid.
71. HAC II: 64.
72. Chann, *Conference on Chinese in Scotland*, May 1976.
73. HAC III: 11.
74. HAC III: 49.
75. Ibid.
76. Ibid.
77. HAC III: 55.
78. HAC II: 126.
79. Ming Tsow, *Mother-Tongue Maintenance: A Survey of Part-Time Chinese Language Classes*, Commission for Racial Equality, London, 1981, 9.
80. Ibid.
81. HAC II: 24.
82. HAC II: 242.
83. Choo Gaik See, "Chinese Music: Soho Style", *China Now*, Autumn 1986, 16.
84. Ibid.
85. Ibid.
86. HAC II: 24.
87. HAC III: 49.
88. HAC II: 46.
89. Broady, *Social Adjustment*, 69.
90. Ng Kwee Choo, *The Chinese in London*, (Institute of Race Relations, UOP, London, 1968), 66.
91. Ibid.
92. Broady, *Social Adjustments*, 69.
93. Ibid.
94. Ibid. 70.
95. Ibid.

96. Ibid.
97. Victor Y.F. Chann, National Conference on Chinese Families in Britain, "The Silent Minority," Commonwealth Institute, 26 November 1982, 3.
98. HAC III: 116.
99. HAC III: 192.
100. HAC III: 191.
101. Ibid.
102. HAC III: 116.
103. Ibid.
104. HAC III: 111.
105. HAC II: 118.
106. HAC III: 146.
107. Ibid.
108. Broady, *Social Adjustment*, p. 74.
109. HAC II: 240.
110. *The Daily Telegraph*, 18 February 1983, 15.
111. HAC III: 50 See also HAC II: 101.
112. Ibid.
113. HAC II: 46.
114. Ibid.
115. HAC III: 64.
116. HAC III: 170.
117. HAC II: 104.
118. *The Chinese in the U. K.*, 17. See also, Victor Chann, Talk given by Representative of Hong Kong Government Office, Office at a Conference organized by the National Association for Multi-Racial Education in Glasgow, 31 January 1976, 11, 12.
119. Waddi Hunt, "Chinese School Children in Britain: A Report", *China Now*, Autumn, 1984, 27.

120. Ibid.
121. Langton, *Chinese Children in British Schools*, n.p.
122. HAC III: 160.
123. Ibid.
124. HAC II: 31.
125. HAC III: 160.
126. HAC II: 18.
127. HAC III: 80.
128. *The Chinese in the U. K.*, 17.
129. Ibid.
130. Hunt, *Chinese School Children in Britain*, 26.
131. HAC II: 210.
132. HAC III: 146.
133. Ibid.
134. *The Times*, 7 October 1974. See HAC I: ix, HAC II: 30 and HAC II: 212.
135. HAC III: 159. See also, *The Chinese in the U. K.*, 15.
136. HAC II: 31.
137. Ibid. See also, *The Chinese in the U. K.*, 15.
138. HAC II: 102. See also, HAC III: 159.
139. Ibid.
140. *The Chinese in the U. K.*, 16.
141. HAC II: 212.
142. HAC II: 212. See also HAC II: 104 and HAC II: 116, 117.
143. Tsow, *Mother-Tongue Maintenance*, 16.
144. HAC II: 32.
145. *The Chinese in the U. K.*, 15.
146. HAC II: 122.

147. HAC II: 27.
148. Ibid.
149. Ibid.
150. HAC II: 240.
151. HAC II: 144.
152. Tsow, *Mother Tongue Maintenance*, 16.
153. HAC II: 23.
154. Ibid.
155. Chann, *The Silent Minority*, 1.
156. Tsow, *Mother-Tongue Maintenance*, 10.
157. Chann, *The Silent Majority*, 2. See also, Tsow, *Mother-Tongue Maintenance*, p. 10.
158. Tsow, *Mother-Tongue Maintenance*, 1.
159. Chann, *The Silent Minority*. 2.
160. HAC III: 106.
161. HAC III: 125.
162. HAC III: 138.
163. Alan M. Uyehara, *Survey of Kung Ho Association*, London, 1985.
164. Ibid.
165. Ibid.
166. Ibid.
167. Ibid.
168. HAC II: 143.

CHAPTER VIII

ENDNOTES

1. Victor Y. F. Chann [photocopy] (25 November 1982) and "Representative of Hong Kong Government Office, London" in Glasgow, "The Social and Educational Background of Hong Kong Immigrants in Britain," [photocopy] (31 January 1976). See United Kingdom, House of Commons, Second Report from the Home Affairs Committee, Session 1984-85, *Chinese Community in Britain*, Volumes I, II, III. (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1985), I: xi. (To be referred to as HAC, volume and page number.)
2. HAC I: ix.
3. Ibid.
4. HAC II: 2.
5. Ibid.
6. HAC II: 45, 46.
7. HAC II: 46.
8. HAC III: 49.
9. HAC III: 49.
10. HAC I: x.
11. HAC I: xi.
12. HAC I: xi.
13. HAC III: 24.
14. HAC III: 184.
15. HAC III: 102.
16. HAC III: 34.
17. HAC I: xi.
18. HAC II: 45. See also HAC I: x, HAC III: 11, HAC III: 194-195, HAC III: 182, HAC III: 178 and HAC III: 24.
19. HAC II: 119.
20. HAC III: 42.

21. Ibid.
22. HAC III: 59.
23. HAC II: 72.
24. HAC III: 64. See also, HAC I: xi.
25. HAC II: 146. See also, HAC III: 15 and *The Times*, 29 January 1984.
26. *The Times*, 19 March 1984.
27. HAC III: 24.
28. Ibid.
29. HAC II: 41. See also HAC II: 34.
30. HAC I: x. See also HAC III: 26.
31. *The Times*, 5 February 1973.
32. Victor Y. F. Chann, *Conference on Chinese in Scotland*, Unpublished speech, May 1976. See also, *The Times*, 6 August 1980.
33. *The Times*, 6 August 1980.
34. HAC I: xi. See also, *Times Educational Supplement*, 31 July 1981.
35. HAC II: 144.
36. HAC II: 46.
37. HAC III: 35.
38. Ibid.
39. HAC II: 119.
40. HAC III: 126.
41. HAC III: 48.
42. HAC III: 175.
43. HAC III: 35.
44. Ibid.
45. HAC III: 97.
46. Ibid.

47. HAC III: 48. See also HAC II: 23.
48. Ibid.
49. Ibid.
50. HAC II: 29.
51. HAC III: xiv.
52. HAC II: 114.
53. HAC III: 17.
54. HAC III: 26.
55. HAC II: 114. See also HAC II: 122, 123.
56. Ibid.
57. HAC II: 102. See also HAC II: 114 and HAC III: lxiii.
58. Ibid.
59. HAC II: 103. See also, HAC II: 113.
60. HAC II: 114.
61. HAC II: 196.
62. HAC II: 15.
63. HAC III: 35.
64. HAC III: 96.
65. Ibid. See also HAC II: 197.
66. HAC III: 49.
67. HAC III: 52. See also HAC III: 196.
68. HAC III: 96. See also, HAC III: 35.
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid.
72. Ibid.
73. Ibid.

74. HAC III: 102.
75. Ibid.
76. Ibid. See also HAC III: 105.
77. HAC III: 102.
78. Ibid.
79. The memberships of the Home Affairs Committee were as follows: Sir Edward Gardner (Chairman), Mr. Gerald Bermingham, Mr. Robin Corbett, Miss Janet Fookes, Mr. Jeremy Hanley, Mr. John Hunt, Mr. Fergus Montgomery, Clare Short, Mr. Ivor Stanbrook, Mr. John Wheeler, and Mr. David Winnick. In addition, a Sub-Committee on Race Relations and Immigration was appointed. They were as follows: Mr. John Wheeler (Chairman), Mr. Robin Corbett, Mr. Jeremy Hanley, Mr. John Hunt, and Clare Short.
80. HAC III: 26.
81. Ibid.
82. Ibid.
83. HAC III: 44.
84. HAC I: lxiv.
85. Ian A. MacDonald, *The New Immigration*, (London: Butterworths, 1972), 17.
86. Ibid.
87. Ibid.
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid.
90. D. Kohler, *Immigration and Race Relations*, Liberal Publications Department, Study Paper #7, 1976, 9.
91. A Liberal Party Report Panel on Immigration and Race Relations, 1974, 4.
92. Ibid.
93. D. Kohler, *Immigration and Race Relations*, 3.
94. A Liberal Party Report, Panel on Immigration and Race Relations, 1974, 4.
95. D. Kohler, *Immigration and Race Relations*, 3.

96. A. Beith, (M.P.) stated in an article, "A New Immigration Policy for Britain," *Contemporary Review*, V. 225, September 1974, 121-126. See also, *A Liberal Party Report*, Panel on Immigration and Race Relations, 1974, 4.
97. A Liberal Party Report, Panel on Immigration and Race Relations, 1974, 4.
98. Alan Beith, "A New Immigration Policy for Britain," *Contemporary Review*, 225: 124, September 1974, 124.
99. I. MacDonald, *Immigration*, 3.
100. A. Beith, *Immigration Policy*, 124.
101. A Liberal Party Report, Panel on Immigration and Race Relations, 1974, 5. See also, MacDonald, *Immigration*, 3,4.
102. Ibid.
103. HAC III: 95.
104. HAC III: 96.
105. Ibid.
106. HAC II: 148.
107. Ibid.
108. HAC II: 156. HAC III: 88.
109. HAC III: 4.
110. HAC III: 84,114.
111. UKIAS, *Report*, 6. See also, HAC III: 1.
112. Ibid.
113. HAC III: 3.
114. Ibid.
115. UKIAS, *Report*, 6.
116. HAC III: 1.
117. Ibid.
118. Ibid.
119. Ibid.
120. Ibid.

121. HAC III: 2.
122. Ibid.
123. HAC III: 21.
124. HAC III: 3.
125. United Kingdom Immigrants Advisory Service, *Annual Report, 1982-83*, 5.
126. Ibid.
127. Ibid.
128. Ibid.
129. Liberal Party, Great Britain Immigration, 4.
130. *Immigration Statistics 1971 to 1983*. See also HAC III: 3-4, and HAC III: 88.
131. HAC II: 147. See also the following HAC II: 150.
132. HAC II: 147.
133. UKIAS, *Annual Report, 1982-83*, 7.
134. HAC III: 35.
135. United Kingdom Immigrants Advisory Service, *Legal Material*, Circular no: 17/83/KD, 4 November 1983, pp, 1,2.
136. The Chinese in the U. K., Conference, 15.
137. Ibid.
138. Ibid.
139. HAC I: lxvi.
140. HAC I: Lxvii.

CHAPTER IX

ENDNOTES

1. Monica Marie Taylor, *Chinese Pupils in Britain: A Review of Research into the Education of Pupils of Chinese Origin*, (NFER-Nelson, 1987) 257.
2. Anne Garvey and Brian Jackson, *Chinese Children*, National Educational Research and Development Trust, 1975, 20.
3. Douglas Jones, "Chinese Schools in Britain: A Minority's Response to its Own Needs," *Trends in Education*, Spring 1980 , 15.
4. Great Britain. Parliament. House of Commons, *Education for All*. The Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups (Swann Report), Cmnd 9453, London, HMSO, 654.
5. Taylor, *Chinese Pupils in Britain*, 3.
6. Ibid., 125.
7. Ibid.
8. Great Britain, *Education for All*, 660.
9. Ibid.
10. Patricia Langton, *Chinese Children in British Schools*, London, Center for Urban Educational Studies, 1979, 6.
11. Great Britain, *Education for All*, 654.
12. Ibid., 664.
13. Ibid., 660.
14. Langton, *Chinese Children in British Schools*, 9.
15. Alfred Chan, *Employment Prospects of Chinese Youth in Britain: A Research Report*, 4.
16. Ibid.
17. Jones, "Chinese Schools in Britain," 18.
18. Ibid.
19. Great Britain, *Education for All*, 661.

20. Chan, *Employment Prospects of Chinese Youth in Britain*, 4
21. Ibid.
22. Irene Jones, "Some Cultural and Linguistic Considerations Affecting the Learning of English by Chinese Children in Britain", *English Language Teaching Journal*, v 34, #1 October 1979, 56.
23. Ib id.
24. Ibid.
25. Taylor, *Chinese Pupils in Britain*, 112.
26. Ibid., 113.
27. Great Britain, *Education for All*, 658.
28. Jones, "Chinese Schools in Britain", 18
29. Great Britain, *Education for All*, 660.
30. Ibid., 663.
31. Ibid., 666.
32. Taylor, *Chinese Pupils in Britain*, 217.
33. Irene Loh Lynn, *The Chinese Community in Liverpool: Their Unmet Needs With Respect to Education, Social Welfare and Housing*, Merseyside Area Profile Group, Department of Sociology, University of Liverpool, 1982, 32.
34. Ibid., 34.
35. Ming Tsow, *Mother-Tongue Maintenance: A Survey of Part-Time Chinese Language Classes*, Commission for Racial Equality, London, 1981, 10.
36. Taylor, *Chinese Pupils in Britain*, 260.
37. Ibid., 2.
38. Lynn, *The Chinese Community in*, 20.
39. Great Britain, *Education for All*, 656.
40. Ibid.
41. Chan, *Employment Prospects of Chinese Youth in Britain*, 7.

42. Ibid.
43. Great Britain, *Education for All*, 663.
44. Taylor, *Chinese Pupils in Britain*, 140.
45. Ibid., 141.
46. Ibid., 260.
47. Ibid., 257.
48. D. E. Ladlow, *Suggestions and Background Information for Teachers of Chinese Children*, Mimeograph, 1980.
49. Taylor, *Chinese Pupils in Britain*, 259.
50. Langton, *Chinese Children in British Schools*, 9.
51. Anne Garvey and Brian Jackson, *Chinese Children*, National Educational Research and Development Trust, 1975, 25.
52. Chan, *Employment Prospects of Chinese Youth in Britain*, 6.
53. Ibid., 10.
54. Ibid., 11.
55. Great Britain, *Education for All*, 666.
56. Ibid., 667.
57. Taylor, *Chinese Pupils in Britain*, 225.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid., 72.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid.
64. Ibid., 217.
65. Ibid., 216.

66. Ibid.
67. Ibid., 217.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid., 218.
70. Chan, *Employment Prospects of Chinese Youth in Britain*, 8.
71. Ibid.
72. Great Britain, *Education for All*, 666.
73. Taylor, *Chinese Pupils in Britain*, 223.

CHAPTER X

ENDNOTES

1. Tadd Fisher, "Hawaii: Growing Pains in Paradise," *Population Bulletin*, V. 29, no. 3 (Washington, D.C., The Population Reference Bureau, Inc.), 3.
2. Andrew W. Lind, *Hawaii's People*, 3rd ed. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967), 16, 17. See Hilary Conroy, *The Japanese Frontier in Hawaii*, (University of California Publications in History, No. 46, 1972), 9.
3. Fisher, *Hawaii: Growing Pains in Paradise*, 3.
4. Sidney L. Gulick, *Mixing the Races in Hawaii: a Study of Coming Neo-Hawaiian American Race* (Honolulu: The Hawaiian Board Book Rooms, 1937), 21. See also, Margaret Young, *Hawaii's People From China*, (Honolulu, Hogarth Press, 1974), 11.
5. Margaret Young, *Hawaii's People From China* (Honolulu, Hogarth Press, 1974), 11. See also Katharine Coman, *The History of Contract Labour in the Hawaiian Islands* (New York, Arno Press, 1978), 2.
6. Ibid., 9-13. See also, Fisher, *Hawaii: Growing Pains in Paradise*, 7.
7. Gulick, *Mixing the Races in Hawaii*, 3.
8. Fisher, *Hawaii: Growing Pains in Paradise*, 6.
9. Ralph S. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom: 1874-1893*, V. 3 (Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 1967), 116. See also Ralph S. Kuykendall, *A History of Hawaii*, Prepared under the direction of the Historical Commission of the Territory of Hawaii, (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1926), 223
10. Fisher, *Hawaii: Growing Pains in Paradise*, 7.
11. Ralph S. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom: 1854-1874*, V. 2 (Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 1967), 177.
12. Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*, 2:178. See also, Ralph S. Kuykendall, *A History of Hawaii*, (Prepared under the direction of the Historical Commission of the Territory of Hawaii, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1926), 224.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Romanzo Adams, *The Peoples of Hawaii: A Statistical Study* (E.H. Winkle, Honolulu, Hawaii, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1933), 9.
16. Clarence Glick, *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese Migrants in Hawaii* (Honolulu, Hawaii, University Press of Hawaii, 1980), 2.

17. Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom* 2:179.
18. Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom* 2:181.
19. Ibid.
20. Glick, *Sojourners*, 9.
21. Ibid., 12, 21.
22. Milton M Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 242.
23. Gulick, *Mixing the Races in Hawaii*, 23.
24. Kuykendall, *History*, 134.
25. Ibid.
26. William Atherton Du Puy, *Hawaii and Its Race Problem* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1932), 102.
27. Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*, 3:325.
28. Ibid.
29. Ralph S. Kuykendall, *A History of Hawaii*, Prepared under the direction of the Historical Commission of the Territory of Hawaii, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1926, 327.
30. Ibid.
31. Adams, *Peoples of Hawaii*, 44.
32. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Subject Report, PC (1)C1, PC (2)1B, PC (2)1G, 1970, 59.
33. Ibid.
34. Betty Lee Sung, *A Survey of Chinese-American Manpower and Employment* (New York, Praeger Publishers, 1976), 56.
35. Milton M. Gordon, "Toward a General Theory of Racial and Ethnic Group Relations", 90.
36. Milton M Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 69.
37. Ibid. 44.
38. Ibid., 46.

39. Sung, *Chinese-American Manpower and Employment*, 72.
40. Glick, *Sojourners and Settlers*, 173.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid., 176.
44. The language schools were initially established to enable children to resume their education in Japan. By 1900, ten language schools had been established with approximately 1,500 pupils. In 1910, 140 schools had well over 7,000 pupils. Finally, in 1916, more than 140 schools with 14,000 pupils had been established. In 1919, the Hawaii State legislature requested the U. S. Commissioner of Education to survey the education in Hawaii. The Commissioner recommended that foreign language schools should be abolished at the next legislature. This was done but the decision was contested by the Japanese community. Eventually the decision was reversed by the United States Supreme Court in 1927. The language schools continued to irritate and antagonize those who were concerned about Japanese loyalty. In 1934, 41,192 children (85%) of all children of Japanese ancestry were of school age. By 1941, the ratio of attendance had dropped to 74.5 percent. Andrew W. Lind, *Hawaii's Japanese: An experiment in Democracy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1946) and James H. Okahata, ed., *A History of Japanese in Hawaii* (Honolulu: The United Japanese Society of Hawaii, 1971), 216-225.
45. Kuykendall, *History*, 327.
46. Fisher, *Hawaii: Growing Pains in Paradise*, 9.
47. Ibid. See also Clarence Glick, *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese migrants in Hawaii* (Honolulu, Hawaii, University Press of Hawaii, 1980), 10.
48. Glick, *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese Migrants in Hawaii*, 38.
49. Ibid., 39, 40.
50. Ibid. See also Clarence Glick, "The Relation Between Position and Status in the Assimilation of Chinese in Hawaii", *The American Journal of Sociology*, V. XLVII, No. 5 (March 1942), 669.
51. Ibid., 67.
52. Ibid., 38.
53. Ibid.
54. Glick, *Relation Between Position*, 671.
55. Sung, *Chinese-American Manpower and Employment*, 76.

56. Ibid., 72.
57. Ibid., 91.
58. Ibid., 103.
59. Lind, *Hawaii's People*, 55.
60. Glick, *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese Migration in Hawaii*, 9.
61. Ibid.
62. Glick, *Relation Between Position*, 673. See also, Lind, *Hawaii's People*, 55.
63. Lind, *Hawaii's People*, 55.
64. Ibid.
65. Ibid., 58.
66. Ibid.
67. Ibid., 49.
68. Glick, *Relation Between Position*, 674.
69. Lind, *Hawaii's People*, 51.
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid., 61.
72. Ibid., 79.
73. Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom* 3:139.
74. Ibid., 3:140.
75. Kuykendall, *Constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom: A Brief History and Analysis*. Paper of the Hawaiian Historical Society, no. 21, Honolulu: 8 October 1940, 52.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid., 52, 53.
78. Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*, 3:182.
79. Ibid., 3:184. See also Kuykendall, *Constitution*, 53-54.
80. Kuykendall, *Constitution*, 60.
81. Adams, *Peoples*, 31.

82. Gulick, *Mixing*, 35.
83. Du Puy, *Hawaii and Its Race Problem*, 110.
84. Ibid., 454.
85. Ibid.
86. Glick, *Sojourners*, 162.
87. Ibid., 161.
88. Gulick, *Mixing*, 161.
89. Adams, *Peoples*, 32.
90. Ibid., 32.
91. Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*, 3:325.
92. Glick, *Sojourners*, 172.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHURCH ARCHIVES

The General Synod of the Church of England. Church House Archives (Westminster).
Commission on Orientals and Others in England, 1930-1932. Survey and budget
Committee Central Committee, London, England [n.d.].

HOME OFFICE PUBLIC RECORDS OFFICE: KEW GARDENS

United Kingdom. Home Office. "Minutes." City of Liverpool City Council, 1907,
1745-6.

_____. "A Petition From Chinese Christian Church." 26 September 1921, HO45/
11843/139147/230a.

_____. "A Statement with Regard to the Expulsions of Aliens: Alien Act 1905."
1910, HO45/24550.

_____. "A Statement with Regard to the Expulsion of Aliens." n.d., HO45/24550.

_____. "Admission of Foreign Students to U.K." n.d., HO45/12269/433840.

_____. "Air Ministry of works and Building." 17 January 1919, HO45/11843/
139147/125a.

_____. "Aliens and Nationality Committee." 27 June 1919, HO45/
11843/139147/137.

_____. "Aliens and Nationality Committee." n.d., HO45/11843/139147/137.

_____. "Cardiff Police Head Constable." 28 September 1908, HO45/149817/3.

_____. "Cardiff Police Constable to Lord Mayor of Cardiff." 28 September 1908,
HO45/149817/3.

_____. "Census of Aliens in U.K." 1915-1924, HO45/11522/287235.

_____. "Census of Aliens." 1916, HO45/11522/159.

_____. "Census of Aliens." 1919, HO45/11522/145.

_____. "Census of Aliens in the U.K." 1921, HO45/11522/168.

_____. "Census of England & Wales." n.d., HO45/11522/168.

- _____. "Census of Aliens in the U.K." 31 December 1924, HO45/11522/187.
- _____. "Central Police Office Birkenhead." 31 March 1906, HO45/11843/139147/03.
- _____. "Chief Inspector Aliens Branch." 11 March 1921, HO45/11843/139147/160.
- _____. "Chinamen in Liverpool." 8 December 1906, HO45/11843/139147/08.
- _____. "Chinamen Resident in the 'Boro'." 7 December 1906, HO45/11849/139147/07.
- _____. "Chinamen Resident in the 'Boro': Chief Constable Birkenhead." 7 December 1906, HO45/11849/139147/07.
- _____. "Chinese Deserters in the U.S.A. " n.d., HO45/11849/139147/128.
- _____. "Chinese in Liverpool." n.d., HO45/24683/16.
- _____. "Chinese Deserters in the USA. " 4 February 1919, HO45/11849/139147/128.
- _____. "Chinese in East End of London. " 19 July 1916, HO45/11849/139147/83.
- _____. "Chinese Seamen Arrested in the USA. " 4 December 1918, HO45/11849/139147/125.
- _____. "Chinese Seamen Arrested in the USA. " 23 December 1918, HO45/11849/139147/124.
- _____. "Chinese in Liverpool. " 31 March 1906, HO45/11849/139147/02.
- _____. "Chinese Trafficking in Opium. " n.d., HO45/24683/32.
- _____. "Chinese at Liverpool." 25 April 1911, HO45/11849/139147/34.
- _____. "Chinese at Liverpool." 25 August 1911, HO45/11849/139147/40.
- _____. "Chinese in Liverpool: Head Constable, Liverpool." 31 March 1906, HO45/11849/139147/02.
- _____. "Chinese in Liverpool." 16 September 1916, HO45/24683/16.
- _____. "Chinese Crews on British Vessels." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/23.
- _____. "Chinese Stowaway Awaiting Deportation." 16 October 1921, HO45/11849/139147/208.

- _____. "Chinese in Limehouse: Report of Miss Robinson's Allegation." 6 February 1911, HO45/11849/139147/18.
- _____. "Chinese Settlement in Liverpool." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/15.
- _____. "Chinese Deportation to Hong Kong." October 1921, HO45/11849/139147/256.
- _____. "Convictions and Expulsions." 1907-1926, HO45/24550/161143.
- _____. "Deportation of Chinese Deserters from the U.S." 31 January 1919, HO45/11849/139147/126.
- _____. "Deportation from America of Chinese Seamen." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/123.
- _____. "Deportation of Chinese Seamen in America." November 1918, HO45/11849/139147/122.
- _____. "Deportation of Chinese Deserters." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/126.
- _____. "Deportation of Chinese Opium Smuggler." 1916-1922, HO45/24683/311604.
- _____. "Deportation of 53 Chinese." 10 June 1919, HO45/11849/139147/135.
- _____. "Deportation of Chinese." n.d., HO45/11849/39147/126.
- _____. "Deportation of 6 Men." September 1921, HO45/11849/139147/175.
- _____. "Desertion of Chinese Seamen." 18 October 1918, HO45/11849/139147/120.
- _____. "Disposal of Chinese Formerly employed in Aerodrome." 24 March 1919, HO45/11849/139147/130a.
- _____. "Disposal of Chinese Formerly Employed in Aerodrome." 28 March 1919, HO45/11849/139147/130a.
- _____. "Disposal of Chinese." n.d., HO45/11849/39147/130.
- _____. "Disposal of Chinese formerly Employed on Aerodrome." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/130a.
- _____. "Employment of Aliens in Munitions Factories." 1916-1919, HO45/10809/311425.
- _____. "Employment of Chinese in British Ships." 23 May 1916. HO45/11849/139147/73.

- _____. "Foreign Student." 1927-1936, HO45/20121/5060475.
- _____. "Foreign Seamen Disembarked." 1926-1933, HO45/14633/49270.
- _____. "Identity Books for Aliens." 1915-19, HO45/10799/307293.
- _____. "Immigration--Action of Master of S.S. Tydeus." 3 March 1914, HO45/11849/139147/53.
- _____. "Importation of Chinese into Liverpool." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/21.
- _____. "Joint Committee on the Nationality of Married Women." n.d., HO45/11522/166.
- _____. "Labour Emergency Expenditure Committee." 2 July 1919, HO45/11849/139147/140.
- _____. "Letter from Foreign Office to Chinese Legation." 9 February 1934, HO45/15592/344072.
- _____. "Letter from Foreign Office to Chinese Legation." 22 March 1934, HO45/15592/344072.
- _____. "Letter from Chief Constable Liverpool." 8 December 1906, HO45/11849/139147/08.
- _____. "Letter to the Ministry of Shipping. 5 September 1918, HO45/11849/139147/113.
- _____. "Letter to the Home Office." 24 May 1919, HO45/11849/139147/130a.
- _____. "Letter of the Board of Trade to Home Office." 4 July 1916, HO45/11849/139147/86.
- _____. "Letter of the Inspector of C.I.D. to Home Office." 13 November 1919, HO45/24683/32.
- _____. "Letter to King George V From the National Sailor's and Firemen's Union." 23 May 1916, HO45/11849/139147/73.
- _____. "Letter to Foreign Office From Chinese Legation." 24 March 1934, HO45/15592/344072.
- _____. "Letter of International Headquarters of Salvation Army to Home Office." 1916, HO45/11849/139147/83.
- _____. "Letter of Officer of the Superintending Aliens Office to Home Office." 20 June 1919, HO45/11849/139147/136.

- _____. "Letter to Home Office." 20 June 1919, HO45/11849/139147/136.
- _____. "Letter to the Home Office." 24 May 1919, HO45/11849/139147/130a.
- _____. "Letter to the Board of Maritime Commission." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/92.
- _____. "List of Chinese Lodging Houses." 27 July 1916, HO45/11849/139147/87.
- _____. "List of Chinese Carpenters Employed on Bicester Aerodrome." 18 January 1919, HO45/11849/139147/125a.
- _____. "Listing of Some Chinese Paying to Get into U.K." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/192.
- _____. "Liverpool Police." n.d., HO45/24683/20.
- _____. "London County Council." 7 November 1918, HO45/11849/139147/119.
- _____. "Male Aliens in the U.K." 1921, HO45/1131522/156.
- _____. "Memorandum of Alien and Nationality Committee." 28 May 1919, HO45/11849/139147/137.
- _____. "Memorandum, Secretary of State." 13 September 1919, HO45/11849/139147/146.
- _____. "Merchant Seamen...Documents of Identity." 1921, HO45/11032/424205.
- _____. "Ministry of Shipping." 8 November 1918, HO45/11849/139147/118a.
- _____. "Minutes of the Aliens and Nationality Committee." 25 June 1919. HO45/11849/139147/137a.
- _____. "Minutes of the Alien and Nationality Committee." 28 March 1919, HO45/11849/139147/130a.
- _____. "Minutes of the Aliens and Nationality Committee." 30 March 1919, HO45/11849/139147/133.
- _____. "Minutes of the Aliens and Nationality Committee." 19 September 1919, HO45/11849/139147/149.
- _____. "Minutes of the Board of Trade." 4 July 1916, HO45/11849/139147/86.
- _____. "Mr. Gladstone." *Proof of Debates*. 25 November 1908, HO45/11849/139147/16.
- _____. "New Scotland Yard." 12 June 1917, HO45/15592/344072.

- _____. "Number of Aliens Registered." 1921, HO45/11522/159.
- _____. "Number of Aliens Registered." 30 November 1922, HO45/11522/162.
- _____. "Number of Aliens Registered." 31 December 1922, HO45/11522/164.
- _____. "Number of Aliens Registered in the U.K." n.d., HO45/11522/159.
- _____. "Numbers of Aliens Registered in Metropolitan Police District." 31 December 1924, HO45/11522/187.
- _____. "Officials of the Chinese Seamen's Union." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/133.
- _____. "Question--Chinese Immigration." 20 April 1911, HO45/11849/139147/33.
- _____. "Questions by Mr Houston." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/32.
- _____. "Registration of Asiatic Aliens." 1917, HO45/10836/33000.
- _____. "Registration of Chinese Subject" 6 August 1917, HO45/15592/344072.
- _____. "Registration of Chinese Subjects." 1917-34, Metropolitan Police Office, 6 August 1917, HO45/15592/344072.
- _____. "Registration of Chinese Subjects: Letter to Foreign Office From Chinese Legation." 24 March 1934, HO45/15592/344072.
- _____. "Registration of Chinese Subjects." n.d., HO45/15592/344072.
- _____. "Registration of Chinese Subjects: New Scotland Yard to Home Office." 12 July 1917, HO45/15592/344072.
- _____. "Repatriation of Chinese." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/146.
- _____. "Repatriation of Chinese Seamen." 30 May 1919, HO45/11849/139147/133.
- _____. "Repatriation of Seamen." 26 June 1919, HO45/11849/139147/136.
- _____. "Repatriation of Chinese Seamen." 7 July 1919, HO45/11849/139147/140.
- _____. "Repatriation of Chinese." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/141a.
- _____. "Repatriation of Chinese Seaman." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/133.
- _____. "Repatriation of Chinese Seamen." n.d., HO45/1843/139147/149.
- _____. "Repatriation of Seamen." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/135.

- _____. "Report of the Head Constable, Liverpool." 19 September 1919, HO45/11849/139147/146.
- _____. "Report of the New Scotland Yard." 26 June 1919, HO45/11849/139147/136.
- _____. "Report to Home Office." 15 August 1919, HO45/11849/139147/141a.
- _____. "Report on Miss Robinson's Allegation regarding Chinamen." 1 February 1911, HO45/11849/139147/18.
- _____. "Report of the Commission Appointed by the City Council to Inquire into Chinese Settlements in Liverpool." 26 June 1907, HO45/11849/139147/16.
- _____. "Report of the Head Constable, Liverpool." 19 July 1919, HO45/11849/139147/141a.
- _____. "Report of the Commission Appointed by the City Council to Inquire into Chinese Settlements in Liverpool." 26 June 1907, HO45/11849/139147/15.
- _____. "Report of the Cardiff City Police." 8 June 1919, HO45/11849/139147/136.
- _____. "Restriction in Alien Seamen." 1914-19, HO45/10776/276521.
- _____. "Smuggling of Chinamen into England." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/205.
- _____. "Smuggling of Chinamen in U.K." 7 July 1921, HO45/11849/139147/164.
- _____. "Smuggling of Chinamen in U.K." 7 July 1921, HO45/11849/139147/165.
- _____. "Smuggling of Chinamen into England." 26 August 1921, HO45/843/39147/173.
- _____. "Smuggling of Chinamen in England." 31 August 1921, HO45/11849/139147/184.
- _____. "Smuggling of 22 Chinese into this Country." 26 August 1921, HO45/11849/139147/167.
- _____. "Smuggling of Chinamen into England." 26 August 1921, HO45/11849/139147/169.
- _____. "Soviet, Japanese and Chinese Marriage and Divorce." 1920-1933, HO45/15078/412/956.
- _____. "Sub Registry III Foreign Office to Home Office." 21 February 1919, HO45/11849/139147/127.
- _____. "Table Showing the Number...." 31 December 1919, HO45/11522/149.

_____. "Table showing the number of Nationalities and offences of Aliens in Prison." n.d., HO45/11522/149.

_____. "The Chinese in England." January 1911, HO45/11849/139147/39.

_____. "The Importation of Chinamen into Liverpool." n.d., HO45/11849/139147/20.

_____. "The Inspector CID." 13 November 1919, HO45/24683/32.

_____. "32 Chinese Trafficking in Opium." n.d., HO45/24683/32

_____. "Total Number of Aliens Approved." 31 January 1918, HO45/10809/311425/81.

_____. "White Hall." 5 August 1914, HO45/10836/33000.

_____. "Yellow Peril in London." 17 January 1921, HO45/11849/139147/157.

HONG KONG GOVERNMENT OFFICE

Chann, Victor. "The Social and Educational Background of Hong Kong Immigrants in Britain." Talk given at a conference organized by the National Association for Multi-Racial Education in Glasgow in 1976.

_____. "Chinese Mother-tongue Teaching in the United Kingdom." 1982.

_____. "Speech to the Conference on the Chinese in Scotland." May 1976.

_____. "The Silent Minority." Speech to the National Conference on Chinese Families in Britain, Commonwealth Institute, November 1982.

Hong Kong House. "Number of Persons Holding British (Hong Kong) Passports...May 1971 to 31 December, 1983." Immigration Statistics, Distributed by the Hong Kong House.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

United Kingdom. House of Commons. "Papers." 1868-1869, LV.

_____. "Papers." 1867. LXIII.

_____. "Papers: General Register and Record Office of Seamen." 11 July 1859. (Session 2) xxviii.

_____. Home Affairs Committee. Second Report. Session 1984-85. *Chinese Community in Britain*. Volumes 1-3. London, H.M.S.O. 1985.

**INNER LONDON EDUCATION AUTHORITY
GREATER LONDON RECORDS OFFICE**

United Kingdom. Inner London Education Authority. "Anti Racist Guidelines for Schools and Colleges." [n.d.]

_____. "Bilingualism in the ILEA." 21 February 1983.

_____. "Delivery of the Authorities Initiatives on Multi-Ethnic Education in Schools." October 1983.

_____. "Draft Reports Submitted by R & S to Education Officer: Ethnic Minority in ILEA." [n.d.]

_____. "Education Committee Policy Coordinating Sub-Committee Report: 1982."

_____. "Education in a Multiethnic Society: An Aide-Memoirs for the Inspectorate." July 1981.

_____. "Education for a Multiracial Society." (Elaine M. Britain). 1983.

_____. "Equality Opportunities: Minutes." 18 October 1983-12 March 1986.

_____. "Further and Higher Education Sub-Committee: Multi Ethnic Education in Further Higher Education and CGC." [n.d.]

_____. "Improving Secondary Schools: A Summary of the Hargreaves Report." [n.d.]

_____. "Information for Parents." Primary Schools Serving the Isle of Dogs and Poplar." [n.d.]

_____. "Multi-Ethnic Education Progress Report." 12 June 1979.

_____. "Multi-Ethnic Education Review." Summer 1982.

_____. "Multicultural Teaching for Practitioners in School and Community." V. 1 No 2, Spring, 1983.

_____. "Paper Prepared for One Day Seminar for Continuing Education for Ethnic Minority Groups in the U.K. (Commonwealth Institute)." 16 March 1983.

_____. "Primary Curriculum Project." Coordinator, Miss Leela Ramdean, n.d.

_____. "Race, Sex & Class Achievement in Schools." 1983.

_____. "Racial Equality and Ethnic Minorities in London: Future Strategy Report 1983-85." 1982.

_____. "Some lifestyles of Chinese people from Hong Kong and Singapore." n.d.

**LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL
GREATER LONDON RECORDS OFFICE**

United Kingdom. London County Council. "Acts of Parliament relating to Housing functions and Lodging Houses, 1891-1920," n.d., HSG/GEN/3/2.

_____. "Admissions Register, Gill Street, LCC." 1906-1932. EO/DIV5/GIL/LB/2.

_____. "Calendars of Prisoners, 1550-1889." MJ/CP/27.

_____. "Chinese Question in East End. Gill Street Limehouse Causeway." n.d., EO/GEN/1/72.

_____. "Common Lodging-Houses and Seamen's Lodging Houses." Acts and By-Laws Applying to London County Hall. Spring Gardens, S.W. March 1908, PH/REG/1/19.

_____. "Common Lodging Houses and Seamens Lodging-House." Acts and By-Laws Applying to London. County Hall, March 1908, PH/REG/1/28.

_____. "Common Lodging Houses: Police Court Proceedings." n.d., PH/REG/1/20.

_____. "Common Lodging Houses Act from January 1895-April 1903." n.d., PH/REG/1/19.

_____. "Cyril Jackson, Admissions Register, April 1947-1950." EO/DIV5/CYR/LB/2.

_____. "Cyril Jackson, LCC, Report 16 June 1925." EO/PS/12/C121/60.

_____. "Cyril Jackson, LCC, 11 February 1931." EO/PS/12/C121/61.

_____. "Cyril Jackson, Admission and Discharge, 1924-1939." EO/DIV5/CYR/LB/2.

_____. "Cyril Jackson Infants, Log Book, 1936-1939." EO/DIV5/CYR/LB/1.

_____. "Dingle Lane LCC, Report 17 March 1932". EO/PS/12/D27/3.

_____. "Dingle Lane LCC, Report 26, 27 January 1932.". EO/PS/12/D27/5.

_____. "Dingle Lane Dolphin Lane Temporary LCC School." 1908.
EO/PS/12/D27/

2.

_____. "Dolphin Lane, Temporary LCC School." 1907. EO/DIV5/CYR/LB/1.

_____. "F.R. Garnhorn, Inspector." 7 February 1911. EO/GEN/1/72.

_____. "Farrence Street, 1913-1939." EO/DIV5/FAR/LB/3.

_____. "Farrence Street, 1914-1918." EO/DIV5/FAR/MIS/1.

_____. "Farrence Street, 1926-1939." EO/DIV5/FAR/LB/1.

_____. "Farrence Street, 1938-1939." EO/DIV5/FAR/LB/2

.

_____. "Farrence Street: Senior Girls, 1931-1939." EO/PS/12/D27/1.

_____. "Feeding of School Children." n.d., PH/SHS/1/12.

_____. "Gill Street: Senior Girls, 1932-1939." EO/DIV5/GIL/LB/2.

_____. "Gill Street Boys. 1929-1938." EO/DIV5/GIL/LB/1.

_____. "Gill Street: Senior Boys, 1906-1932." EO/DIV5/GIL/LB/2.

_____. "Gill Street School Infants, 1923-1947." EO/DIV5/GIL/LB/2.

_____. "Gill Street School Infants. 1929-1945." EO/DIV5/GIL/LB/2.

_____. "Gill Street Admission's Register (Junior Boys), 1932-1938."

EO/DIV5/

GIL/LB/2.

_____. "History of Intermediate Scholarships." EO/PS/3/19.

_____. "Inspector's Report. Dingle Lane LCC (Poplar)." 17 March 1932, EO/
DIV5/ DIN/LB/1.

_____. "Junior County Scholarships." 1905-39, EP/PS/3/10.

_____. "Licensing of Seamen's Lodging Houses: Annual Meetings for Licensing
1910-29." Boarding House Keepers, PH/REG/1/23.

_____. "Medical Examinations of Scholarship Candidates." 1921-30, PH/SHS/1/7.

_____. "Medical and Dental Treatment." 1919-20. PH/SHS/1/17.

_____. "Medical and Dental Treatment." PH/SHS/1/16.

- _____. "Medical Inspection of School Children." PH/SHS/1/14.
- _____. "Medical Examinations of Scholarship Candidates." 1914-20, PH/SHS/1/6.
- _____. "Medical Examinations of Scholarship Candidates." 1931-44, PH/SHS/1/8.
- _____. "Memorandum from the Medical Officer." EO/GEN/1/72.
- _____. "Miscellaneous Printed Reports in Lodging Houses." 1890-1938, HSG/GEN/2/36.
- _____. "Miss Robinson's Question." EO/GEN/1/72.
- _____. "Northey Street: Girls." 1903-1921. EO/DIV5/NOR/MIS/1.
- _____. "Northey Street: 1914-1918. EO/DIV5/NOR/MIS/2.
- _____. "Northey Street: Girls." 1921-1939. EO/DIV5/NOR/MIS/1.
- _____. "Northey Street: Infants." 1893-1906. EO/DIV5/NOR/MIS/1.
- _____. "Northey Street: Infants." 1906-1924. EO/DIV5/NOR/MIS/1.
- _____. "Northey Street: Punishment Book." 1912-1933. EO/DIV5/NOR/MIS/1.
- _____. "Northey Street: Visitor's Book--1886-1913." EO/DIV5/NOR/MISC/3.
- _____. "Public Control Department." 30 January 1911. EO/GEN/1/72.
- _____. "Records of Conviction, Depositions." 1855-1889, MSJ/CR/47.
- _____. "Registers of Appeals." 1867-1888, MJ/SBA/26.
- _____. "Returns of Aliens." 1797-1798. MJ/CJU/26.
- _____. "Returns of Aliens." 1797-1798, MR/A/49.
- _____. "Returns of Aliens." 1798, WR/A/49.
- _____. "Ricardo Street: Infants." 1883-1890. EO/DIV5/RIC/LB/1.
- _____. "Ricardo Street: Infants." 1890-1899. EO/DIV5/RIC/LB/1.
- _____. "Ricardo Street: Infants." 1899-1909. EO/DIV5/RIC/LB/1.
- _____. "Ricardo Street: Infants." 1909-1921. EO/DIV5/RIC/LB/1.
- _____. "Ricardo Street: Infants." 1921-1935. EO/DIV5/RIC/LB/1.

- _____. "Ricardo Street: Girls." 1900-1915. EO/DIV5/RIC/LB/1.
- _____. "Ricardo Street: Senior Girls." 1929-1939. EO/DIV5/RIC/LB/1.
- _____. "Ricardo Street: Boys." 1887-1902. EO/DIV5/RIC/LB/1.
- _____. "Ricardo Street: Boys." 1896-1926. EO/DIV5/RIC/LB/1.
- _____. "Scholarship Holders." EO/HFE/3/13.
- _____. "Sir Edward Henry." 16 February 1911. EO/GEN/1/72.
- _____. "Sir Edward Henry From Mr. Blair." 20 March 1911. EO/GEN/1/72.
- _____. "Slum Areas in London." 8 February 1924. HSG/GEN/2/22.
- _____. "The Great War Roll of Service of Norhey Street School, Limehouse, 1914-1918, EO/DIV5/NOR/MIS/2..

MARINE MISCELLANEOUS INDIA HOUSE LIBRARY

Parliamentary Papers. Chinese Emigrants, mortality on British Ships, 1858 (521).

- _____. Registration and Licensing...and the Enforcement of Legal Requirements. Common Lodging Houses and Seamen's Lodging Houses. PH/REG/1.
- _____. Report on Lascars and Other Asiatic Seamen. 1814-15. A Parliamentary Committee Set-up and Submitted Report, 1814.
- _____. Report of the Committee on Lascars and other Asiatic Seamen. 11 July 1815.
- _____. Return showing the names of all Aliens to Whom Artifacts of Naturalisation have been issued...during 1899, giving country and places of residences...in combination of #140 of 1899 (113) LXVII, 481.
- _____. Marine Miscellaneous Series of the India Office Records. Papers on Lascars 1793-1818. Part 1 IOR: L/MAR/C/902.
- _____. Marine Miscellaneous Series of the India Office Records. Papers on Lascars 1793-1818. Part 2. IOR: L/MSR/C/902.

**MARINE TRANSPORTATION
PUBLIC RECORDS OFFICE: KEW GARDEN**

United Kingdom. Marine Transportation. "Agreement." MT9/3650.

_____. Aliens, MT9/3/40890/3.

_____. Alleged Illegal Supply of Seamen, MT9/487/M13526/93.

_____. Alleged Illegal occupancy of Seamen by a Boarding house Keeper.
MT9/487/M13526/93; MT9/489/M16423/93.

_____. Articles of a Vessel...Chinese Seamen, MT9/677/M6953/01.

_____. As to Alleged Refusal of the Coolie Crew, MT9/506/M3627/94.

_____. As to Licensing of Seamen's Boarding Houses. MT9/63/M1344/72;
MT9/300/M1786/87; MT9/344/M839/89.

_____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British
Ships, MT9/309/M8086/87.

_____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British
Ships, MT9/469B/M4354/93.

_____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British
Ships, MT9/96/M14809/74.

_____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British
Ships, MT9/96/M14809/74; MT9/261/M22187/85; MT9/262//M82/86;
MT9/276/M3755/86; MT9/281/M7135/86; MT9/309/M8086/87;
MT9/469B/M4354/93; MT9/531/M3965/95; MT9/532/M5181/95;
MT9/555/M7094/96; MT9/619/M10991/99; MT9/649/M11163/1900;
MT9/678/M8486/01; MT9/685/M12552/01; MT9/685/M13362/01.

_____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British
Ships, MT9/715/M3324/02.

_____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British
Ships, MT9/619/M10991/99.

_____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British
Ships, MT9/555/M7094/96.

_____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British
Ships, MT9/276/M3755/86.

_____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British
Ships, MT9/718/M3745/02.

- _____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British Ships, MT9/531/M3965/95.
- _____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British Ships, MT9/678/M8486/01.
- _____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British Ships, MT9/649/M11163/1900.
- _____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British Ships, MT9/685/M13362/01.
- _____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British Ships, MT9/532/M5181/95.
- _____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British Ships, MT9/261/M2218/85.
- _____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British Ships, MT9/685/M12552/01.
- _____. As to the Engagement and Employment of Foreign Seamen on Board British Ships, MT9/729/M8699/02.
- _____. As to the Grant Licenses to Superintendent.... MT9/62/M10989/71.
- _____. As to the Inspection of Lascar Seamen. MT9/154/M9278/78.
- _____. As to the Report of Employment of Foreign Seamen, MT9/281/M7135/86.
- _____. As to the responsibility for the expenses of other seamen left behind in the U.K., MT9/M69/1255/73.
- _____. As to the Transfer of Lascar Seamen, MT9/418/M22691/91.
- _____. As to the Transfer of Lascar Seamen, MT9/502/1774/94.
- _____. As to the Transfer of Lascar Seamen, MT9/605/M310/99.
- _____. As to the Transfer of Lascar Seamen, MT9/653/M18500/190.
- _____. As to the Transfer of Lascar Seamen, MT9/679/M8754/01.
- _____. As to the Transfer of Lascar Seamen, MT9/240/M7079/84.
- _____. As to the Transfer of Lascar Seamen, MT9/734/M11413/02.
- _____. As to the Transfer of Lascar Seamen, MT9/602/M22185/98.

- _____. As to the Transfer of Lascar Seamen. MT9/621/M10989/71;
MT9/240/M7079/84; MT9/418/M22691/91; MT9/502/M1774/94;
MT9/589/M2651/98; MT9/602/M22185/98; MT9/605/M310/99;
MT9/607/M631/99; MT9/653/M18500/190; MT9/679/M8754/01;
MT9/734/M11413/02.
- _____. As to the Transfer of Lascar Seamen, MT9/62/M10989/71.
- _____. Assistant of Marine Department, MT9/63/M1344/72.
- _____. Case of Mo King Chau, MT9/4106.
- _____. Chinese Seamen Employed in British Mainland Shipping, MT9/5476/
M5461/50.
- _____. Comparative Table Illustrating Inequalities of Treatment Between
Chinese and British Seamen, Chinese Nationalist Daily., 18 & 19 January 1945,
MT9/4106/72116.
- _____. Conveyance of Chinese Coolies, MT25/3/20890/1918.
- _____. Correspondence. MT9/3350.
- _____. Endorsement of the Articles of a vessel....MT9/677/M6953/81.
- _____. Enemy aliens--employment of, MT9/1008/M29633/1915.
- _____. Foreign Seamen, MT9/3/40890/141.
- _____. Foreign Seamen and Lascars Engaged..., MT9/506/M3395/94.
- _____. Hong Kong, MT9/3/40890/50.
- _____. Illegal Borders of a vessel by a Boardinghouse Keeper. MT9/321/M381/
88.
- _____. Illegal Boarding of a Vessel, MT9/321/M381/88.
- _____. Immigration, MT9/3/40890/51.
- _____. Instruction to Superintendents as to the Wages of Lascars, MT9/240/
M7079/84.
- _____. Interview by Mr Gary (Liverpool), MT9/66/M9638/72.
- _____. Issue of a Poster to ward Chinese Seamen of the Penalties of Smuggling
Opium, MT9/4003/M9075/44.
- _____. Liberty Ships Assignment to the Chinese Government, MT9/4109/M792/45.

- _____. List of Approved Boarding Houses in Cardiff, Liverpool.... MT9/205/M7866/82; MT9/292/M53/87.
- _____. Liverpool, Cardiff, London..., MT9/292/M53/87.
- _____. Mercantile Marine Pensions Scheme, MT9/3751/M14306/42.
- _____. Ministry of War Transport. MT9/4011.
- _____. Ministry of Shipping, MT9/3/40890/88.
- _____. National Chinese Seamen's Union Liverpool. MT9/3692
- _____. Negotiations Between Dutch and Chinese Authorities Regarding Wages, MT9/4005/M10236/44.
- _____. 1900-1910 London Order in Council, MT9/879/M10147/1910.
- _____. 1901-1929 Failure to join Ships, MT9/1888/M7608/1929.
- _____. 1913-17 Employment of Chinese and Asiatics, MT9/1087/M5/49/1917.
- _____. 1916-1934 London Order in Council, MT9/2370/M9164/1934.
- _____. 1933-1946 Licensing of Boarding Houses, MT9/4412/M44624/46.
- _____. 1939 Seamen Abroad: Aliens Order, MT9/3131/M12939/39.
- _____. 1940-41 Seamen Abroad, MT9/3350/M12977/40.
- _____. 1940-41 Seamen Abroad, MT9/4370/M952/46.
- _____. 1942, Pronouncement by the Chinese Government, MT9/4052/M11543/44.
- _____. 1942-1943, Mercantile Marine Pension Scheme, MT9/3751/M14306/42.
- _____. 1942-1943, Request for Recognition of National Chinese Seamen's Union, MT9/3692/M10213/42.
- _____. 1942-1943 Agreements Regarding the Terms and Conditions of Employment of Chinese Seamen, MT9/3650/M7481/42.
- _____. 1942-1943, Agreement in Liverpool, MT9/3743/M13421/42.
- _____. 1942-1946 Chinese Seamen's Articles, MT9/4446/M7547/46.
- _____. 1942-43 Agreement in Liverpool respects of Chinese seamen serving in British Ocean-going vessels, MT9/3743/M13421/42.

- _____. 1942-43 Request for Recognition of the National Chinese Seamens Union. MT9/3692/M10213/42.
- _____. 1942-44, Negotiations Between Dutch and Chinese Authorities, MT9/4025/M10236/44.
- _____. 1942-46 Chinese Seamens articles, MT9/4446/M7547/46.
- _____. 1943-45, Liberty Ships Assigned to the Chinese government MT9/4109/M792/45.
- _____. 1943-46 Chinese Desertion at New York, MT9/4370/M952/46.
- _____. 1944-45, Issue of a Poster of War, MT9/4003/M9075/44.
- _____. 1945, Recruitment of Chinese Seamen for Service in the Far East, MT9/4125/M2307/45.
- _____. 1950-51 Chinese Seamen Employed in British Mainland Shipping, MT9/5476/M5461/50.
- _____. Numbers of Foreign Seamen Employed... MT9/524/M21966/94.
- _____. President of the Board of Trade, MT9/205/M7866/82.
- _____. Pronouncement by the Chinese Government, MT9/4052/M1543/44.
- _____. Recruitment of Chinese Seamen to Service the East, MT9/4125/M2307/45.
- _____. Registry of Seamen, MT9/3/40890/112.
- _____. Repatriation, MT9/3/40890/115.
- _____. Return of Lascars and Other Asiatics, MT9/262/M82/86.
- _____. Returns of Lascars and other Asiatic....MT9/262/M82/86.
- _____. Seamen Abroad, MT9/4125.
- _____. Seamen's Lodging Houses, MT9/3/40890/123.
- _____. Seamens Cooking Classes, MT9/423/M421/192.
- _____. Smuggling, MT9/3/40890/135.
- _____. Statistics, MT9/3/40890/153.
- _____. Transfer of a Chinese Fireman. MT9/619/M10986/99.

_____. Use of Chinese Labour for Military Purposes, MT25/8/77164/1917.

_____. Wages of Chinese Seamen, MT9/600/M20066/98.

**METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF POPULAR
TOWER HAMLETS CENTRAL LIBRARY**

Metropolitan Borough of Poplar. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1910.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1915.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1918.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1921.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1925.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1930.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1935.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1939.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1945.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1950.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1955.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1960.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1965.

_____. The Parish of Poplar Borough. Valuation List 1973

ST. CATHARINE'S HOUSE

United Kingdom. St. Catharine's. Registry of Births. 1890-1985.

_____. St. Catharine's. Registry of Marriages, 1890-1985.

**THAMES MAGISTRATES COURT RECORDS
GREAT LONDON RECORDS OFFICE**

United Kingdom. Thames Magistrates Court Records (Uncatalogued). Greater London

Records office. In the Metropolitan Police District: Register of the County. Summery Jurisdiction Setting at Thames Police Court: 1880-1913.

_____. Thames Police Court. In the Metropolitan Police District. Register of County Summary Jurisdiction Sitting at Thames Police Court, 1884+.

INTERVIEW

Body, Ruth. Interview by author, 15 June 1985, Rochford, Essex, England.

MONOGRAPHS & PERIODICALS

Adams, Romanzo C. *Interracial Marriages in Hawaii: A Study of the m...Conditioned Process of Aculturaltion and Amalgamation*. New Jersey: Pattern Smith, 1969.

_____. *The Peoples of Hawaii*. Honolulu, Hawaii: American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1933.

Alba, Richard D. "A Comment on Schoen and Cohen." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 87, no. 4 (1982) : 935-939.

_____. "Assimilation's Quiet Tide." *The Public Interest*, 119, (Spring 1995) : 3-18.

Allen, Gary Wilson and Asselineau, Roger. *St. John De Crevecoeus: The Life of An American Farmer*. New York: Viking, 1987.

Armfelt, Count E "Oriental London." in Sims, George. *Living London*. London: Cassels, 1902.

Bagley, Christopher. "Interracial Marriage in Britain." *New Community*, 1:4 (Summer 1972): 318-326.

Barth, Fredrik. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Boston: Little Brown, 1969.

Barth, Gunther. *Bitter Struggle: A History of the Chinese in the United States, 1850-1870*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Bash, Harry H. *Sociology, Race and Ethnicity*. New York: Bordon and Breach, 1979.

Baskin, Darryl. *American Pluralist Democracy: A Critique*. New York, London: Van Nostrand-Reinhold, 1971.

Beach, Walter. "Some Considerations in Regard to Race Segregation in California." *Sociology and Social Research* XVIII (March 1934), 340-50.

- Beith, A. "New Immigration Policy For Britain." *Contemporary Review* 225 (September 1974) : 121-6.
- Berridge, V. "East End Opium Dens and Narcotic Use in Britain." *The London Journal* 4:1 (1978).
- Blau, P.M. "Intersecting Social Affiliates and Inter-marriage." *Social Forces*. 62, (March 1984): 585-606.
- Blalock, Hubert. *Toward a Theory of Minority Group Relations*. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Bloom, D. E. "The Changing Labour Market Position of Canadian Immigrants." *Canadian Journal of Economics*. 28, no. 46 (Nov 1995): 987-1005.
- Bonacich, Edna. "A Theory of Middleman Minorities." *American Sociological Review* V. 38, (October 1973): 583-594.
- Bourne, Richard. "The Mandarins of Soho." *Observer Magazine* (19 April 1981) : 36-43.
- Bowker, Gordon, ed. *Race and Ethnic Relations: Sociological Readings*. London: Hutchinson & Co. Ltd., 1976.
- Broady, Maurice. *The Chinese Family in Liverpool: Some Aspects of Acculturation*. B.A. Thesis, Liverpool, 1952.
- _____. "The Social Adjustment of Chinese Immigrants in Liverpool." *Sociological Review* 3:11 (1955): 65-75.
- Broom, Leonard. "The Validation of Acculturation: A Condition of Ethnic Assimilation." *American Anthropologist* LVII:48 (1955): 44-48.
- Bryan, Derek. "Chinese Community in Britain." *China Now* (Autumn 1984): 23- 24.
- Bugelski, B.R. "Assimilation Through Inter-marriage." *Social Forces* 40 (August 1962): 148-53.
- Cardwell, M. (ed). *Charles Dickens: The Mystery of Edwin Drood*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1972.
- Carmon, Naomi, ed. *Immigration and Integration in Post-Industrial Societies: Theoretical Analysis and Policy-Related Research*. London: Macmillan in association with Centre for research for Ethnic Relations, University of Warwick, 1996.
- Castles, Stephen. *Immigrant Workers and Class Structures in Western Europe*. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

- Chadwick, Bruce A. and Stauss, Joseph H. "The Assimilation of American Indians into Urban Society: The Seattle Case." *Human Organization* Vol 34 no.4 (Winter 1975): 359-369.
- Chan, Alfred. *Employment Prospects of Chinese Youth in Britain: A Research Report*. London: Commission for Racial Equality, 1986.
- Chang, Stephen. *The Chinese Around the World. Mountain View*. California: World Chinese Publishing Association, 1970.
- "Changes in Values and Strategies Among Chinese in Hawaii." *Sociology and Social Research* 56 (January 1972): 228-41.
- Chann, Victor Y.F. *Chinese Mother-tongue Teaching in the United Kingdom*. Unpublished paper, Hong Kong Government Office, 1982.
- _____. *Paper to National Conference on Chinese Families in Britain*. In National Children's Centre, *The Silent Majority*. The Report of the Fourth National Conference on the Chinese Community in Great Britain, November 1982. Huddersfield: NCC.
- Chen, Jack. *The Chinese of America*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980.
- Chen, T. *Chinese Migration with Special Reference to Labor Conditions*. United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, No. 340, 1923.
- "Chinese School in London." *The China Journal*, XXII:1 (January 1935).
- Chu, Y. K. *History of the Chinese People in America*. New York: The China Times, 1975.
- Cheng, Yuan. *Education and Class: Chinese in Britain and the U.S.* 1994.
- Cheong, Jannette. "From the East End of the Far East." *Eastern Horizon* (September 1978) : 11-17.
- Clarke, Sir Edward. *Report upon the present disputes affecting transport workers in the Port of London*. {CD 6229} H.C. (1912-B) XLVII.
- Cohen, S. M. and Fein, L. J. "From Integration to Survival: American-Jewish Anxieties in Transition." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*. 480 (July 1985): 75-88.
- Collins, Sydney. *Coloured Minorities in Britain: Studies in British Race Relations based on African, West Indian and Asiatic Immigrations*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1957.
- Coman, Katharine. *The History of Contract Labour in the Hawaiian Islands*. New York: Arno Press, 1978.

- Conroy, Hilary. *The Japanese Frontiers in Hawaii*, no. 46. University of California Publications in History, 1972.
- Convention Between the United Kingdom and China Respecting the Employment of Chinese Labour in British Colonies and protectorates. Signed at London 13 May 1904.
- Coolidge, Mary Roberts. *Chinese Immigration*. New York: Paragon Book Gallery, Ltd., 1909.
- Cornell, Stephen and Hartmann, Douglas. *Ethnicity and Race: Making Identities in a Changing World*, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Pine Forge Press, 1997.
- Cortese, Anthony Joseph Paul. *Ethnic Ethics: The Restructuring of Moral Theory*. Albany: New York State University, 1996.
- Crowley, John Crowley, "Immigration and 'Race Relations' in Britain and France", in Naomi Carmon, *Immigration and Integration in Post-Industrial Societies: Theoretical Analysis and Policy-Related Research*, (London: Macmillan in association with Centre for research for Ethnic Relations, University of Warwick, 1996), 230-245.
- Depres, Leo. *Ethnicity and Resource Competition in Plural Societies*. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.
- "Disarranging Marriages....." *Economists (London)*, 273 (8 December 1979): 12+.
- Dormon, J. H. "Ethnicity in Contemporary America." *Journal of American Studies* 15 (December 1981): 325-39.
- Du Puy, William Atherton. *Hawaii and Its Race Problem*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1979.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. *The Absorption of Immigrants*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954.
- Ellison, Christopher G. and Martin, W. Allen. *Race and Ethnic Relations in the United States: Readings for the 21st Century*. Los Angeles, California: Roxbury Publishing Company, 1997.
- Evans, J. M. *Immigration Law*, 2d ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1983.
- Fairchild, Henry Pratt. *Immigration: A World Movement and Its American Significance*. New York: Macmillan, 1925.
- Fisher, Tadd. "Hawaii: Growing Pains in Paradise." *Population Bulletin* Vol 29, no. 3 Washington, D.C., The Population Reference Bureau, Inc., 1973.

- Fitchett, Norman. *Chinese Children in Derby*. Diploma Course: Education in Multi-Racial Society, January 1976.
- Fletcher, M.E. *Report on an Investigation into the Coloured Problem in Liverpool*. Liverpool Association for the Welfare of Half-cast Children. 1930.
- Fong, L.K.W. *Chinese Children in Liverpool*. Diploma in Special Education Thesis, University of Liverpool, 1981
- Fong, S. L. M. "Assimilation and Changing Social Roles of Chinese Americans." *Journal of Social Issues* 29:2 (1973): 115-27.
- Freeberne, Michael. "Chinese succeed in the U.K." *Geographical Magazine*. 53 (August 1981) : 706-707.
- Fugita, S.S. and O'Brien, D.J. "Structural Assimilation, Ethnic Group Membership, and Political Participation Among Japanese Americans." *Social Forces*. 63 (June 1985): 986-95.
- Furnhan, A. and Shiekh, S. "Gender, Generational and Social Support Correlates of Mental Health in Asian Immigrants." *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*. 39 (Sept 1993): 22-33.
- Galens, Judy et. al. *Gale Encyclopedia of Multicultural America*. Contributing Editor, Rudolph Vecoli, Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research, 1995.
- Garvey, Anne and Jackson, Brian. *Chinese Children. Research Action Project into the Needs of Chinese Children*. National Educational Research and Development Trust, 1975.
- _____. "The Chinese Children of Britain." in *Races and Immigration: A New Society Social Studies Reader*. 2nd Edition, 1975, 21-23.
- Gibson, Margaret A. *Accommodation Without Assimilation: Sikh Immigrants in an American High School*. 1988.
- Gillborn, David and Gipps, Caroline. *Recent Reserach on the Achievements of Ethnic Minority Pupils*. Institute of Education, University of London, Office for Standards In Education, London: HMSO, 1996.
- Glazer, Nathan and Moynihan, Daniel P. *Ethnicity: Theory and Practice*, Cambridge. Harvard University Press, 1978.
- _____. "Is Assimilation Dead?" *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*. 530 (November 1993): 122-36.
- Glick, Clarence. *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese migrants in Hawaii*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University Press of Hawaii, 1980,

- Goldenberg, V and Saxe, L. "Social Attitudes of Russian Immigrants to the United States." *Journal of Social Psychology*. 136 (Aug 1996): 421-34.
- Gordon, Milton M. "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality." *Daedalus: The Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* (Spring 1961): 263-285.
- _____. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origin*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- _____. "Ethnic Groups in American Life." *Daedalus: The Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* (Spring 1961):
- _____. *Human Nature class and Ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- _____. "Social Structure and Goals in Group Relations." In *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*, ed. Monroe Berger, Theodore Abel and Charles H. Page. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1954, 141-157.
- Great Britain. Committee of Inquiry Into the Education of Children from Ethnic Groups. *Education for All*. The Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups. HMO, March 1985.
- Gulick, Sidney L. *Mixing the Races in Hawaii: A Study of Coming Neo-Hawaiian American Race*. Honolulu: The Hawaiian Board Book Rooms, 1937.
- Gull, B Manico. "The Story of the Chinese Labour Corps." *Far Eastern Review* (April 1818): 125-35.
- Gurak, Douglas T. and Fitzpatrick, Joseph P. "Intermarriage among Hispanic Groups in New York City." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 87, no. 4 (1982): 921-22.
- Hammond, P.E. and Warner, K. "Religion and Ethnicity in Later 20 Century America." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*. 527 (May 1993): 55-66.
- Hansen, Marcus Lee. "Third Generation in America." *Commentary* (November 1952): 493+.
- Hays, Edward C. "Some Social Relations Restated." *American Journal of Sociology*, 32 (November, 1925): 333-346.
- Heiss, J. "Factors related to Immigrant Assimilation." *Human Organization*, 26 (Winter 1967): 265-72.
- Hirschman, C. "America's Melting Pot Reconsidered." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9 (1983): 397-423.

- Hirschman, Charles and Morrison G. Wong, "Trends in Socio-economic Achievement Among Immigrant and Native-born Asian Americans. *Sociological Quarterly*, V 22, N 4, (1981) 495-514.
- Ho, Kwai-wah Mary. Report on Fieldwork Placement in Westminster Community Relations Council from 18th October 1976 to 14th January, 1976.
- Holmes, C. *Immigrants and Minorities in British Society*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978.
- House, Floyd N. "Social Relations and Social Interaction." *American Journal of Sociology* 31 (March 1926): 626-627.
- Hugill, Stan. *Sailortown*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1967.
- Hur, Won Moo and Kwang, Chung Kim. "The 'Success' Image of Asian Americans: Its Validity, and Its Practical and Theoretical Implications," in Christopher G. Ellison and W. Allen Martin, *Race and Ethnic Relations in the United States*, Los Angeles, California: Roxbury Publishing Company, 1997, 110-117.
- Hwang, S. S. and Murdock, S. H. "Residential Segregation and Ethnic Identification Among Hispanics in Texas." *Urban Affairs Quarterly*. 23 (March 1988): 329-45.
- Ikels, Charlotte. *Aging and Adaptation: Chinese in Hong Kong and the U.S.* 1983.
- Jones, D. Caradog. *The Social Survey of Merseyside*. Vol. 1. Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1934.
- _____. *The Social Survey of Merseyside*. Vol. 2. Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1934.
- Jones, Douglas. "Chinese Schools in Britain: A Minority's Response to Its Own Needs." *Trends in Education*, Spring (1980): 15-18.
- _____. "The Chinese in Britain: Origins and Development of a Community." *New Community* 7 (Winter 1979): 397-402.
- _____. "The Roots of the Chinese in Britain." *China Now*, Autumn (1984): 12-15.
- Jones, Frederick. "Among the Chinese Labour Groups in France." *East and West* (April 1919): 134-7.
- Jones, Irene. "Some Cultural and Linguistic Considerations Affecting the Learning of English by Chinese Children in Britain." *English Language Teaching Journal*, 34 (1): 55-61.
- Kahn, J.R. "Immigrant Selectivity and Fertility Adaptation in the United States." *Socail*

- Forces*. 67 (Sept 1988): 108-28.
- Kalmijn, M. "The Socioeconomic Assimilation of Caribbean American Blacks." *Social Forces*. 74 (March 1996): 911-30.
- Kallen, Horace M. *Culture and Democracy in the United States*. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1924.
- Kekes, John. *The Morality of Pluralism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Kennedy, Ruby Jo Reeves. "Single or Triple Melting-Pot? Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940." *American Journal of Sociology* (1944): 331-339.
- Kent, Susan, ed. *Cultural Diversity Among 20th Century Foragers: An African Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996
- Kerrigan, Colm. *A History of Tower Hamlets*. London: London Borough of Tower Hamlets, 1982.
- Kohler, D. *Immigration and Race Relations*, Study Paper, no. 7. London: Liberal Publications Department, 1976.
- Kossoudji, S. A. "Immigrant Worker Assimilation: Is it a Labour Market Phenomenon." *Journal of Human Resources*. 24 (Summer 1989): 494-527.
- Kung, S. W. *Chinese in American Life*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1962.
- Kuykendall, Ralph. *Constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom: A Brief History and Analysis*. Paper of the Hawaiian Historical Society, no. 21, Honolulu: 8 October 1940.
- _____. *The Hawaiian Kingdom, 1854-1874: Twenty Critical Years*, Vol. 2. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1953.
- _____. *The Hawaiian Kingdom, 1874-1893*, Vol. 3. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967,
- _____. *A History of Hawaii*. Prepared under the direction of the Historical Commission of the Territory of Hawaii. New York: The Macmillian Company, 1926.
- Ladlow, D. E. *English Language Difficulties for Chinese Speakers*. Liverpool: Local Educational Authority Language Centre, 1979.
- Lai, Kai-Chung. *Problems Facing Chinese Immigrants from Liverpool*. 1975. (Typescript).
- Lai, Yeuk-lin Linda. *Chinese Families in London: A Study into their Social Needs*.

- Unpublished MA Thesis, Brunel University, 1975.
- Landecker, Werner S. "Types of Integration and Their Measurement." *American Journal of Sociology* 56 (1951): 332-340.
- Langton, Patricia. *Chinese Children in British Schools*, no. 2. London: Centre for Urban Educational Studies, 1979.
- Lee, S.M. "Intermarriage and Ethnic Relations in Singapore." *Marriage and Family*. 50 (Feb 1988): 255-65.
- Leon, J. J. "The East-West Pattern of Ethnic Intermarriage and marital assimilation in Hawaii, 1969-69-1971 and 1979-1981." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*. 26 (Summer 1995): 247-53.
- Lennoys, Annis. "China Town in London Town." *Sunday Magazine*, 1899, 508+.
- Lester, Anthony. *Race and Law*. London: Longman, 1972.
- Leung, Tim. *Report On Chinese Community*. Liverpool: City of Liverpool Social Services Department, 1979.
- Li, Anne Marie. *A Study of the Chinese in London, their Background, Health Problems and Health Educational Needs*. 1983. (Polytechnic Dissertation. Typescript)
- Lieberson, S. and Waters, M.C. "The Ethnic Responses of Whites. What Causes Their Instability, Simplification; and Inconsistency (1980 Census)." *Social Forces*. 72 (December 1993): 421-50.
- Lim, Su Pao. "Solving the Chinese Puzzle." *Community Care*. 8 January 1981.
- Lind, Andrew W. *Hawaii's People*, 3d ed. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967.
- _____. *Hawaii's Japanese: An experiment in Democracy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1946.
- "London's Chinatown." *The Christian Herald and Sings of Our Times*, 22 November 1934.
- Lothian Community Relations Council. *Needs of the Chinese Community in Lothian*. Based on a Study by Edith Chan. 1983. (Typescript).
- Lovel, John Christopher. *Stevedores and Dockers; A Study of Trade Unionism in the Port of London. 1870-1914*, 1969.
- Lynch, James. *Education for Citizenship in a Multicultural Society*. London: Ansell, 1992.

- Lynn, Irene Loh. *The Chinese Community in Liverpool: Their unmet Needs with Respect to Education, Social Welfare and Housing*. 1982.
- MacDonald, Ian A. *The New Immigration Law*. London: Butterworths, 1972.
- MacInnes, Colin. "The Celestial Element." *New Society*, 19 September 1963, 6-7.
- Malchow, H.L. "Trade Unions and the Emigration in Later Victorian England: A National Lobby for State Aid." *Journal of British Studies* 15 (Spring 1976): 92-116.
- Mangum, Charles S. Jr. *The Legal Status of the Negro*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1940.
- Mark, Diane Mei Lin. *The Chinese in Kula: Recollections of a Farming Community in Hawaii*. Hawaii: Hawaii Chinese History Center, 1975.
- Masey, D.S. "The New Immigration and Ethnicity in the United States." *Population Development Review*. 21 (Sep 1995): 631-52.
- Massey, Douglas S. and Mullan, Brendan P. "Processes of Hispanic and Black Spatial Assimilation." *American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 89 no. 4 (1984): 836-872.
- May, J.P. *The British Working Class and the Chinese*. M.A. Dissertation, Warwick, 1973.
- May, J.P. "The Chinese in Britain, 1860-1914." In *Immigrants and Minorities in British Society*, ed. Colin Holmes, 111-124. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978.
- Mears, Eliot Grinnel. *Resident Orientals on the American Pacific Coast*. Chicago: 1923.
- Miller, Stuart. *The Unwelcome Immigrant*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- Mitchell, George. *Down in Limehouse*. London: Stanley Martin & Co. Ltd. 1925.
- Moghadden, F.M. and Perreault, S. "Individual and collective Mobility Strategies Among Minority Group Members." *Journal of Social Psychology*. 132 (June 1992): 343-57.
- Mogridge, Basil. "Militancy and Inter-Union Rivalries in British Shipping." *International Review of Social History* (1961): 375-412.
- Montagu, William. *Round London: Down East and Up West*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1892.
- Montero, D. and Tsukashima, R. "Assimilation and Education Achievement."

Sociological Quarterly 18 (Autumn 1977): 490-503.

Morton, H. V. *The Nights of London*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1926.

Moynihan, Daniel. "Transcript of the American Conference on the Negro American: May 14-15, 1965." *Daedalus* 95.1 (Winter 1966): 343+.

Nally, Mike. "The Scouse Chinese." *New Society* (25 May 1982): 465-466.

National Educational Research and Development Trust. *Chinese Children in Britain*. Report of a conference held at the Commonwealth Institute, 1977.

National Register, 13 October 1813.

Ng, Kwee Choo. *The Chinese in London*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Okahata, James H. ed. *A History of Japanese in Hawaii*. Honolulu: The United Japanese Society of Hawaii, 1971.

One Who Has Tried It, "What Opium Smoking Feels Like." *JBP Collection*. Stepney 10805 (1870).

Otero, J.F. "Labor View of U.S. Immigration Policy." *Humanist* (Nov/Dec 1981): 39-43.

Pagnini, Deanna L and Morgan, S. Philip. "Intermarriage and Social distance Among U.S. Immigrants at the Turn of the Century." *American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 96 no. 2 (September 1990): 405-32.

Park, Robert E. "Assimilation, Social." in Edwin R. A. Seligman and Alvin Johnson, eds. *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. V. 2. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930.

_____. "Cultural Conflict and the Marginal Man." in Talcott Parsons, ed. et al, *Theories of Society: Foundations of Modern Sociological Theory*. New York, The Free Press, 1965.

Park, Robert E and Burgess, Ernest W. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921.

_____. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," *The American Journal of Sociology* XXXIII (May 1928) : 881-893.

Parry, Jan. "The New Britons." *Observer* (12 December 1971): 38-41. 43-4.

Parsons, Talcott. *Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory*. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

_____. "Some Theoretical Considerations on the Nature and Trends of Change of

- Ethnicity." in Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, ed. *Ethnicity: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Pehna-Lopes, V. "What Next? On Race and Assimilation in the United States and Brazil." *Journal of Black Studies*. 26 (July 1996): 809-26.
- Population Bulletin. *Hawaii: Growing Pains in Paradise*, no. 29:3. Washington: A Publication of the Population Reference Bureau, Inc., 1973.
- Portes, A. and Zhou, M. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*. 530 (November 1993): 74-96.
- Potter, B. "East London Labour." *19th Century* XXIV (1888): 178-179.
- Powell, Rob. "Dragon Dancing in Manchester." *New Society* 21 (January 1982): 105-106.
- The Proceedings of the National Conference at the Chinese Historical Society of America (San Francisco, California), (July 10-12, 1975): 16-24.
- Renecke, John E. *Feigned Necessity: Hawaii Attempt to Obtain Chinese Contract Labor, 1921-23*. 1979.
- Rex, John. *Ethnic Minorities in the Modern Nation State: Working Papers in the Theory of Multiculturalism and Political Integration*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996.
- Richardson, H. W. "British Emigration and Overseas Investment: 1872-1881." *Economic History Review* (25 February 1972): 99-113.
- Richmond, Anthony H. *Colour Prejudice in Britain*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954.
- Rogers, Byron. "The Strange Community of Gerrard Street." *Daily Telegraph* (13 March 1970): 9+.
- Rose, Millicent. *The East End of London*. London: Cresset Press, 1951.
- Ross, J. A. "Urban Development and the Politics of Ethnicity, A Conceptual Approach." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 5 (October 1982): 440-56.
- Rubinoff, L. "Multiculturalism and the Metaphysics of Pluralism." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 17 (Spring 1982): 122-30.
- Rubinov, S. "Toward an Immigration Policy." *Commentary*. 71 (February 1981): 55-58.
- St. John Crevecoeur, J. Hector. *Letters from an American Farmer*. New York: Albert

- and Charles Boni, 1925.
- Sandmeyer, Elmer. *The Anti-Chinese Movement in California. Urbana.* Illinois: The University of Illinois Press, 1939.
- Scammell, M. "Chinaman in Bloomsbury." *Times Literary Supplement.* (10 July 1981) 4084: 789+
- Schermerhorn, R.A. *Comparative Ethnic Relations.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M. Jr. *The Disunity of America.* New York and London: W.W. North & Company, 1992.
- Schmitt, Robert C. *Demographic Statistics of Hawaii, 1778-1965.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1968.
- Schoen, Robert and Cohen, Lawrence E. "Theory and Method in the Study of Ethnic Endogamy Among Mexican American Grooms." *American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 87, no. 4 (1982): 939-942.
- Schoen, Robert and Cohen, Lawrence E. "Ethnic Endogamy Among Mexican American Grooms: A Reanalysis of Generational and Occupational Effects." *American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 86, no. 2 (July 1980/May 1981): 360+.
- Schwartz, Shepard. "Mate Selection Among New York City's Chinese Males, 1931-1938." *American Journal of Sociology* LVI (6): 562-68.
- "Second Generation Immigrant Children Do Better." *Times Educational Supplement,* 1980.
- Seward, George. *Chinese Immigration.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1881.
- Shang, Alfred. *The Chinese in Britain.* London: Batsford, Academic and Educational, 1984.
- Sills, D. L. ed. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences.* New York: Macmillian Company and The Free Press, 1921.
- Simpson, George Eaton. "Assimilation," in Kuper Adams, ed. *Social Science Encyclopedia.* London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.
- Sims, George. *Living London.* London: Cassell and Co. Ltd., 1902.
- Sinclair, Robert. *East London.* London: Robert Hale Ltd., 1950.
- Siu, Paul. "The Sojourner." *American Journal of Sociology* 58 (1952): 34-44.
- Spiro, Jelford. "The Acculturation of American Ethnic Groups." *American*

Anthropologist 57 (1955): 1242-56.

Stevens, G. and Swicegood, G. "The Linguistic Context of Ethnic Endogamy." *American Sociological Review*. 52 (Feb 1987):73-82.

_____. "Nativity, Intermarriage and Mother Tongue Shift." *American Sociological Review*. 50 (Feb 1985): 74-83.

Stones, Vernon. "Chinese Wives in Britain." *Guardian* (16 June 1965): 8.

Stover, Leon. *China: an Anthropological Perspective*. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear, 1976.

Stueber, Ralph Kant. *Hawaii: A Case Study in Development Education 1778-1960*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1981.

Sung, Betty Lee. *A Survey of Chinese-American Manpower and Employment*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976.

Taylor, Monica J. *Chinese Pupils in Britain: A Review of Research into the Education of Pupils of Chinese Origin*, National Foundation for Educational Research, 1987.

Taylor, P.A. "Education, Ethnicity and Cultural Assimilation in the U.S." *Ethnicity* 8 (March 1981): 31-49.

"The Celestial Element." *New Society* (19 September 1963) : 6-7.

"The United Kingdom Immigration Act 1971." *Law Review* 11 (June 1973): 54-67.

"The Immigration Bill (1971: Some Provisions and Legislative History)." *Labour Research* 60 (April 1971): 60-2.

"The Politics of Immigration After the 1971 Act." *Political Quarterly* 44 (April/June 1973): 183-96.

The Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups. *Education for All*. Chairman: Lord Swann FRSE, London: HMSO, 1985.

"The Rise and Fall of Immigration." *Economists* (London) 283 (17 April 1982): 39-40.

"The Tory Immigration Act." *Labour Research* 62 (October 1973): 214-5.

Thernstrom, Stephan ed. *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*. Cambridge: The Belnap Press of Harvard University Press, 1980.

Thompson Stephen I. "Assimilation and Nonassimilation of Asian-Americans and Asian Peruvians." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 21 (October 1979):

Thorogood, Horace. *East of Oldgate*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1935.

Tocqueville Alexis de. *Democracy in America* (1835).

Tsai, S. H. "Reaction To Exclusion: The Boycott of 1905 and Chinese National Awakening." *Historian* 39 (November 1976): 95-110.

Tsang, Janet. "Forfeiting Tradition to Fit in With Western Ways." *Daily Telegraph*. (18 February 1983): 15.

Tsow, Ming. *A Day with Ling*. London: Hamilton, 1982.

_____. *Mother-Tongue Maintenance: A Survey of Part-Time Chinese Language Classes*. London: commission for Racial Equality, 1981.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Subject, Table 22.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Subject Report, PC (1)C1, PC (2)1B, PC (2)1G, 1970.

United Kingdom Immigrants Advisory Service. "Legal Material." 17/83/KD, 4 November 1983.

United Kingdom. Statistical Abstract for the U.K. in each of the last 15 years. 1885-99 (#47), 1900 cd. 306, CCVII, 1.

United Kingdom Immigrants Advisory Service. Annual Report. 1982-3.

United Kingdom Immigrants Advisory Service. Annual Report. 1983-4.

Van Den Berghe, Pierre L. *Race and Ethnicity: Essays in Comparative Sociology*. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Watson, James L. *Between Two Cultures: Migrants and Minorities in Britain*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 19??

_____. *Emigration and the Chinese Lineage: The Mans in Hong Kong and London*. Berkeley & London: University of California Press, 1975.

Wilks, H.C. *George Green's School and Its Surroundings In and Near Poplar*. London: Edward Arnold, Published at the School, 1971.

_____. *George Green's School: 1828-1978*. London: Edward Arnold, 1979.

Williams, Montagu. *Round London: Down East and Up West*. London: MacMillan & Co., 1892.

Williams, N. "The Assimilation Model, Family Life, and Race Ethnicity in the United

- States: The Case of Minority Welfare Mothers." *Journal of Family Issues*. 16 (May 1995): 380-405.
- Wirth, Louis. "The Problem of Minority Groups." In Linton, Ralph (ed) *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.
- Woldemikael, T. M. "Assertion Verses Accommodation: A Comparative Approach to Intergroup Relations." *American Behavioural Science*. 30 (Mr/Ap 1987): 411-28.
- Wong, Bernard. *Chinatown: Economic Adaption and Ethnic Identity of the Chinese*. 1982.
- _____. "A Comparative Study of the Assimilation of the Chinese in New York City and Lima, Peru." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 20 (July 1978): 335-58.
- Woodcock, George. *The British in the Far East*. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1969.
- Wu, S. Y. *One Hundred Years of Chinese in the United States and Canada*. Hong Kong: S. Y. Wu, 1954.
- Yao, Ester Lee. "The Assimilation of Contemporary Chinese Immigrants." *The Journal of Psychology* 101 (January 1979): 107-113.
- Yinger, J. Milton. "Toward a Theory of Assimilation and Dissimilation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4:3 (July 1981): 249-264.
- Young, Margaret. *Hawaii's People From China*. Honolulu: Hogarth Press, 1974.
- Young, N.F. "Changes in Values and Strategies Among Chinese in Hawaii." *Sociology & Social Research* 56 (January 1972): 228-41.
- Yuan, D. Y. "Voluntary Segregation: A Study of New Chinatown." *Phylon*, XXIV:3 (1963): 255-65.
- Zangwill, Israel. *The Melting Pot*. New York: Macmillan, 1909.
- Zo, Kil Young. *Chinese Emigration into the United States, 1850-1880*. 1978.

NEWSPAPERS

- Daily Chronicle. "East End Racial Feud." 29 May 1919.
- _____. 12 May 1908.

_____. 15 December 1920.

Daily Express. 27 March 1936.

_____. March 1936.

_____. 13 February 1934.

_____. "Western Progress Threatens the 'Orient' in London's East End." 27 March 1936, p.3.

_____. "White Girls 'Hypnotised' by Yellow Men." 5 October 1920.

_____. "Yellow Peril in London." 20 October 1920.

Daily Graphic. 4 February 1908.

Daily Herald. "Fools Rush in....". 8 January 1919.

Daily Mail. 7 October 1920.

_____. 8 October 1920.

_____. 9 October 1920.

_____. 15 Jan 1921.

Daily News. "London's Expanding Chinatown." 15 April 1920.

Daily Sketch. 23 April 1934.

Daily Telegraph. "Children of Chinatown." 26 June 1920.

_____. "Opium Dens Raided." 23 January 1919

_____. 10 December 1906.

_____. 26 June 1920.

_____. 5 October 1920.

_____. 15 January 1921.

_____. 13 March 1970. p.9+.

_____. 18 February 1983. p. 15.

East End News. "A Specimen of Chinese Cleanliness." 30 June 1908.

_____. "Anti-Chinese Agitation in Poplar." 12 February 1908.

_____. "Anti-Chinese Agitation." 15 May 1908.

_____. "China Town." 13 June 1916.

_____. "Chinatown Lawsuit." 30 May 1916.

_____. "Chinatown Lawsuit." 2 June 1916.

_____. "Chinatown's Lure of Pretty Clothes." 7 October 1920.

_____. "Chinese Fighting Each Other." 9 March 1917.

_____. "Chinese in Limehouse." 19 June 1908.

_____. "Chinese Lodging House." 23 May 1911.

_____. "Death." 19 September 1919.

_____. "Dingle Lane Boy's School." 12 September 1919.

_____. "Dingle Lane School." 21 October 1910.

_____. "Dingle Lane School." 13 April 1917.

_____. "Funeral of Mr. J. J. Gale." 19 September 1919.

_____. "Gambling Raid in Pennyfields." 21 June 1918.

_____. "Gaming House Raid at Pennyfields." 29 May 1917.

_____. "Murderous Fracas Among Foreign Sailors." 9 May 1911.

_____. "Police raid a flat in Limehouse." 24 December 1953.

_____. "Reward." 14 April 1914.

_____. "Seamen's Conflict at Pennyfields." May 1908.

_____. "Thames Magistrate on Chinatown." 6 October 1920.

_____. "The Anti-Chinese Outbreak." 27 June 1916.

_____. "The Chinese Battle." 13 March 1917.

_____. "The Chinese Battle." 16 March 1917.

_____. "The Chinese Riots." 4 May 1917.

_____. "The Limehouse Chinamen." 18 January 1921.

_____. "The Murder of Chinaman." 26 May 1911.

_____. "The Trouble in Limehouse Chinatown." 7 March 1912.

_____. "The Turbulent Chinese." 30 April 1912.

_____. 9 November 1909.

_____. 21 July 1916.

_____. 28 February 1950.

East London Advertiser. "Chinamen Vacate Limehouse." 22 January 1921.

_____. "East London Opium Dens." 20 November 1909.

_____. "East End Warfare." 4 May 1912.

_____. "East London Matters and L. C. C." 30 June 1909.

_____. "Fan Tan in Pennyfields." 20 December 1946.

_____. "Limehouse Street Fight." 20 April 1912.

_____. "Men from Pennyfields." 21 February 1942.

_____. "Opium Smoking." 2 February 1951.

_____. "Poplar School Accommodation." 18 June 1910.

_____. "Riot at Limehouse China Town." 12 May 1916.

_____. "Wily Chinamen in Poplar." 21 May 1910.

_____. "Wong Ming and Ah Sing Assault." 20 April 1912.

_____. 18 February 1936.

_____. 14 August 1943.

East London Observer. "A New Poplar School." 22 October 1910.

_____. "East London's Chinatown." 27 May 1916.

_____. "Effect of the Language Test." 10 April 1909.

_____. "Language Test." 10 April 1909.

_____. "Limehouse Chinese School." 25 December 1920.

_____. "What Chinatown Says." 7 October 1920.

_____. 13 May 1908.

Evening Express. 18 August 1916.

Evening News. Flautau, Dorota. "Chinatown As I Know It." 7 October 1920.

_____. "Girls who Propose to Chinamen." 14 October 1920.

_____. "Yellow Perils." 5 October 1920.

_____. January 1901.

_____. 7 October 1920.

_____. 11 April 1931.

_____. 24 June 1947.

_____. 29 May 1950.

_____. 19 July 1955

Evening Standard. "Chung Hwa." 7 October 1940.

_____. "Limehouse Lures." 24 February 1920.

Evening Times. 17 August 1916.

Guardian. Hebert, Hugh. "Frozen Out?." 20 December 1973, 9.

_____. "Chinese in Waiting." 19 September 1964, 5.

_____. "Chinese wives in Britain." 16 June 1965, 8.

_____. "Tiger Balm Community." 2 January 19620, 5.

The Honolulu Advertiser. "Waves of Immigrants Built Industrial America." 17 September 1984, 11.

The Liverpool Courier. "Chinatown in Liverpool." 27 December 1906.

_____. 15 January 1906.

_____. 9 March 1906.

_____. 26 March 1906.

_____. 27 November 1906.

The Manchester Guardian. 13 December 1920.

The Morning Chronicle. 29 July 1782.

The News and Chronicle. 24 June 1908.

Observer. 12 December 1971, p 38-44.

The Seaman. "Alien Restriction (Seamen) Order in Council, 1915." 13 August 1915.

_____. "Arabs and Chinese Taking the Place of British Seamen." 26 March 1930, 1,2.

_____. "Blackleg Labour." November 1907, 4.

_____. "Checking the Chinese." February 1908, 3.

_____. "Chinamen on British Ships." May 1908, 5.

_____. "Chinatown 'Boarding-houses.'" 2 June 1916, 5.

- _____. "Chinese Cheap Labour." March 1908, 2-5.
- _____. "Chinese in British Ships." February 1908, 3,4.
- _____. "Chinese on British Ships." July 1908, 6,7.
- _____. "Chinese Seamen." 28 March 1919.
- _____. "Chinese Seamen." May 1908, 3.
- _____. "Chinese Seamen on American Ships." May 1908, 5.
- _____. "Chinese 'Slimness'." May 1909, 10.
- _____. "Engagements of British and Foreign Seaman...." June 1930.
- _____. "Evading the Language Test." June 1908, 3.
- _____. "Great National Protest." 5.
- _____. "Language Test for Seamen." December 1907, 4.
- _____. "Medical Examination of Seamen." November 1907, 4
- _____. "Mr. Havelock Wilson, M.P., and the New Regulations." December 1908, 12.
- _____. "Orientals in British Ships." 29 November 1933, 1, 2.
- _____. "Registration of Seamen." 3 February 1922.
- _____. "Scotland's Yellow Peril." June 1916.
- _____. "Solving the Chinese Puzzle." May 1908, 4.
- _____. "Table, showing the Monthly Rates of Wages...." 20 June 1919, 4, 5.
- _____. "The Cardiff Protest." 29 January 1915, 4.
- _____. "The Census of the Sea." January 1908, 5, 6.
- _____. "The Chinaman as Criminal." May 1908, 3.
- _____. "The Chinese Peril--A Final Warning." 2 June 1916, 4
- _____. "The Chinese Problem." August 1908, 3.
- _____. "The Chinese Question." 19 September 1919, 5.

- _____. "The Gentle Chinaman." May 1908, 3.
- _____. "The Interpretation of the Merchant Shipping Act." December 1908.
12.
- _____. "The Lascar." January 1908, 9.
- _____. "The Language Test." February 1908, 4.
- _____. "The Manning of the British Mercantile Marine." 28 March 1919, 3.
- _____. "The Revolt of the White Seaman." June 1908, 2-7.
- _____. "The Unemployment Problem in the British Mercantile Marine...." 20
February 1935, 4,5.
- _____. "White versus Chinese Seamen." 2 June 1916, 4.
- _____. "The Yellow Man Must Go!" 5.
- _____. "The Yellow Peril: What Chinese-loving Shipowners are Responsible
for." 2 June 1916, 5.
- _____. "The Yellow Problem." January 1908, 13.
- _____. 30 July 1915, 4.
- _____. 19 November 1915, 7.
- _____. 19 November 1915, 3.
- _____. 25 August 1916, 7.
- _____. 25 October 1918, 3.
- _____. 14 February 1919, 4.
- _____. 6 June 1919, 2.
- _____. 19 March 1920, 2.
- _____. 11 June 1920, 3.
- _____. 15 June 1923, 3.

South Wales Daily News. 12 November 1910.

_____. 5 March 1910.

_____. 8 October 1921.

_____. 18 October 1910.

_____. 12 November 1910.

The Star. "Chinaman's Home Smashed." 19 March 1965.

_____. "Sociological Report on Immigrant Settlement in London's East End."

_____. "The Evil Trade in Opium." 3 January 1919.

_____. 1 April 1966.

_____. 11 June 1919.

_____. *19 February 1934.*

Sunday Times. 10 September 1950.

Sunday Times Magazine. 30 April 1972, p. 45.

The Times (London). "1982 Figures." 24 June 1983, 2a.

_____. "A New Yellow Peril." 10 June 1916.

_____. "Celebrations in Soho for 'Year of the Pig'." 12 February 1983,
VIIIa.

_____. "Chinaman and Lascars, Disturbances." 3 May 1912, 5c.

_____. "Chinaman Murdered in Limehouse." 8 May 1911.

_____. "Chinaman Stabbed in Limehouse." 3 April 1912, 10c.

_____. "Chinaman Stabbed in Limehouse." 15 April 1912.

_____. "Chinamen and English girls." 19 September 1917, 3c.

_____. "Chinamen--Gambling charges in Liverpool." 28 February 1906, 10b.

_____. "Chinamen Ship Charters to Convey Dead to China." 19 November
1860, 7c.

_____. "Chinamen's Alleged Crime." 18 October 1915, 5c.

- _____. "Chinamans Body Found in Warley Woods." 30 January 1919, 19d.
- _____. "Chinatown in London." 25 November 1913, 6a.
- _____. "Chinese Abroad, The Chinese Commission on." 27 September 1887, 13a.
- _____. "Chinese Ambassador at Windson." 11 August 1919, 13c.
- _____. "Chinese Ambassador Takes a House in Folkeston." 5 September 1883, 9f.
- _____. "Chinese and Coloured Seamen." 21 March 1919, 15f.
- _____. "Chinese and European, Mixed Marriages." 13 November 1905, 5d.
- _____. "Chinese, Application to the Lord Mayor." October/December 1835, 3.
- _____. "Chinese Cafe--Prosecution Dism.." 3 January 1925, 7b.
- _____. "Chinese Colony: Espionage by Seamen." 10 June 1916, 3d.
- _____. "Chinese Colony in London." 25 November 1913, 6a.
- _____. "Chinese Distinguished in England." 10 October 1889 7c.
- _____. "Chinese Drug Traffic, Letter." 10 April 1923, 13e.
- _____. "Chinese Embassy." 1 May 1878, 9e.
- _____. "Chinese Embassy in London." 16 October 1868, 8d.
- _____. "Chinese Embassy in London." 16 February 1886, 8c.
- _____. "Chinese Embassy in London Plead for Pardon of the Drunkard who Assaulted One of the Staff." 7 February 1877, 7f.
- _____. "Chinese Embassy to England." 9 September 1875, 5d.
- _____. "Chinese Envoy to England." 4 May 1897, 6a.
- _____. "Chinese Employment on English Ships." 18 June 1858, 12d.
- _____. "Chinese Funeral." 24 May 1865, 11f.
- _____. "Chinese Funeral in England." 31 August 1887, 4.
- _____. "Chinese Gambling." 2 November 1872, 4a.

- _____. "Chinese Gambling house in Cardiff." 21 January 1911. 9b.
- _____. "Chinese--Immigration: Questions." 20 April 1911. 10c.
- _____. "Chinese Immigrants Detained." 22 November 1906. 10e.
- _____. "Chinese Immigrants in Liverpool." 27 April 1911.
- _____. "Chinese in British Ships." 10 February 1920. 13c.
- _____. "Chinese in England, Meeting to Consider." 21 September 1882. 6.
- _____. "Chinese in English Territory." 25 January 1893. 3c.
- _____. "Chinese in Europe." 22 November 1879. 11e.
- _____. "Chinese in Great Britain, Letter." 10 August 1922. 11b.
- _____. "Chinese in Liverpool." 14 December 1906. 10.
- _____. "Chinese in Liverpool." 2 July 1907. 10e.
- _____. "Chinese in London." 11 September 1916. 5c.
- _____. "Chinese in London, Letter on." 20 October 1900. 20c.
- _____. "Chinese in London." 18 April 1968. 2f.
- _____. "Chinese Industrial Invasion of London." 30 October 1900. 14.
- _____. "Chinese Jurists in London." 18 July 1910. 9d.
- _____. "Chinese Jurists in London." 5 October 1910. 10c.
- _____. "Chinese Labour." 4 April 1873.
- _____. "Chinese Labour in England." 18 July 1910. 9d.
- _____. "Chinese Labour in England." 21 September 1882.
- _____. "Chinese Launderer, Letter on." 21 April 1938. 13e.
- _____. "Chinese Laundry men in London." 11 December 1900. 15.
- _____. "Chinese Legation." 24 November 1879. 9f.
- _____. "Chinese Legation in London." 10 June 1907. 8c.
- _____. "Chinese Merchants in London." 23 November 1881. 6d.

- _____. "Chinese Merchant in Mincing Lane." 19 February 1870, 4c.
- _____. "Chinese Minister in London." 4 April 1900, 5.
- _____. "Chinese Minister in London." 11 November 1907, 10d.
- _____. "Chinese Minister in Sheffield." 27 May 1914, 21e.
- _____. "Chinese Minister, New to London." 1 June 1889, 7f.
- _____. "Chinese Mission." 1 June 1889, 7.
- _____. "Chinese Mission in Europe." 31 August 1887, 3.
- _____. "Chinese Murdered in Limehouse." 8 May 1911, 13e.
- _____. "Chinese Restaurants." 20 November 1970, 6b.
- _____. "Chinese Students Arrival in England." 6 April 1929, 12b.
- _____. "Chinese Students in Great Britain." 15 October 1924, 11f.
- _____. "Chinese, the 4 Destitutes." Jan 1836, 2.
- _____. "Chinese Women." 12 December 1826.
- _____. "Chinese Women in England." October/December 1826, 12.
- _____. "Chinese Women in England." 12 June 1909, 16f.
- _____. "Commission for Racial Equality Urges MSC to include...." 10 February 1983, 4g.
- _____. "CRE Report Recommends that Children Should be Taught to Speak Their Mother Tongue." 18 August 1982, 3a.
- _____. "Dispute in the Chinese Quarter, 1916.
- _____. "East End Opium Dens." 24 August 1918.
- _____. "Estimates Suggest Over one Million "Queens Chinese" in U.K. Claiming British Citizenship may also be Malaysian Citizens." 25 January 1980, 5b.
- _____. "Facts Against Rhetoric." 17 January 1921.
- _____. "Funeral in England." 31 August 1887, 4f.
- _____. "Government to Examine Ways of Collecting Statistics on

Achievement." 13 June 1982, 4b.

_____. Harris, Derek. "Integrating Britain's Independent Chinese." 6 August 1980, 21.

_____. "Imperial Life Opens Office in London's Chinatown to Cater Specifically For...." 20 November 1982, 13e.

_____. "Integrating Britains Independent Chinese." 6 August 1980, 21c.

_____. "Legation in Europe." 9 July 1887, 5f.

_____. "Limehouse Causeway." 27 May 1916, 4b.

_____. "Lodging Houses, Unlicensed." 10 June 1916, 3d.

_____. "Merseyside Police Mount Campaign to Help Chinese Combat Crime in More Conventional Fashion." 12 February 1980, 4e.

_____. "Mission in Europe." 32 August 1887, 3f.

_____. "Mr Churchill and the Employment of Chinese Seamen." 13 June 1908, 13.

_____. "National Sailors and Firemen's Union send deputation to Mr. W. Churchill on Employment of Chinese seamen." 13 June 1908, 13f.

_____. "New Year Celebrations Described." 24 August 1983, 8F.

_____. "Official Figure for Possible Migrants Challenged." 6 April 1982, 5f.

_____. "Opium Unauthorized Possession." 23 May 1925, 13e.

_____. "Reception of the Chinese Ambassador." 15 October 1883.

_____. "Relevant Figures From 1981 Census." 23 February 1983, 2d.

_____. "Seamen's Certificate." 17 December 1879, 8e.

_____. "Seamen's Grievances meeting in Glasgow." 20 November 1879, 10c.

_____. "Select Committee Hears Allegations of Discrimination by Merseyside Employers." 15 October 1980, 3d.

_____. "Strong Protests At Trade Congress." 9 September 1916.

_____. "Study Reveals Much Greater Diversity Among Ethnic Population." 9 January 1983, 1a.

_____. "The Destitute Chinese." 21 January 1836.

_____. "The Thousands of Children We Never Even Notice." 7 October 1974, 8e.

_____. "The Yellow Peril in London." 15 January 1921.

_____. 12 December 1826.

_____. 21 January 1836.

_____. 14 November 1836.

_____. 10 May 1855.

_____. 4 April 1873.

_____. 25 August 1877.

_____. 22 November 1878.

_____. 22 Nov 1879.

_____. 21 Sept 1882.

_____. 18 October 1915.

_____. 9 September 1916, 7c.

_____. 4 October 1920.

_____. 6 October 1920.

_____. 17 June 1921

Times Educational Supplement. "Article Reports on Liverpool Community." 31 July 1981, 23a.

_____. "Fostering the Mother Tongue." 18 November 1983, 14a.

_____. "Glasgow Conference Discusses Cultural Contributions." 28 November 1980, 5a.

_____. "Government Seeking Ways of Monitoring Achievement." 16 June 1982, 6e.

_____. "Hong Kong Debates Educational Policy." 27 February 1981, 5a.

_____. "Urged to Speak Out about Educational and Social Problems that Children Face." 17 December 1982, 10d.

Wall Street Journal. 6 October 1971, 178:1.

Western Mail. 29/30 January 1892.

PUBLIC SCHOOL RECORDS

Coopers Company and Coborn. Admission's Records, 1900+.

Davenant School Records (Boys): 1915-1939.

Davenant School Records (Infants): 1932-1939.

George Greens School. Admission's Records: Girls, 1884-1910.

George Greens School. Admission's Records: Boys.", 1884-1909.

